

go (9) this way, some connect. You've got a building out (10) here. You've got the maintenance records out (11) here. I understand. I didn't mean to imply that.

(12) A: For the tail end where you hit RMA\$ and (13) then out to the switch, that's correct.

(14) Q: And then up here we have MACSTAR. Is (15) that what it is, MACSTAR and CCRS, one or the (16) other? Depending on what central office you're (17) talking about.

(18) A: Yes.

(19) Q: MACSTAR and CCRS are connected to RMA\$; (20) correct?

(21) A: That's correct.

(22) Q: So orders that come out of MACSTAR and (23) CCRS make it to the switch through RMA\$.

(24) A: Yes. And what you also have — and I

Page 140

(1) think when I was talking about the development (2) required, I may not have mentioned these pieces, (3) also. The ordering and the billing systems also (4) tie in to the MACSTAR arrangements. Those would (5) also require further development for creating this (6) capability that we're talking about.

(7) Q: Sure. You'd have to do some other (8) modifications to your other OSS's.

(9) A: Yes.

(10) Q: Just the way Bell Atlantic has modified (11) all of these OSS's and claimed \$108 million in OSS (12) development costs for the things it chose to (13) modify. Isn't that generally accurate?

(14) A: I'm not familiar with the \$108 million (15) and...

(16) Q: When the Centrex customer wants to change (17) something out here in the switch using recent- (18) change functionality, how does it communicate to (19) MACSTAR or CCRS?

(20) A: It's got a terminal.

(21) Q: So the Centrex customer has the (22) equivalent of the Bell Atlantic order-taker, who's (23) got a computer terminal, and the Centrex customer (24) enters some electronic software-driven changes,

Page 141

(1) which go to MACSTAR CCRS, which flow through to (2) RMA\$, which flow through the switch. Is that (3) correct?

(4) A: Not completely. I would not come (5) anywhere near to equating the terminal and the (6) capability the Centrex customer has to the terminal (7) and the capability that the Bell Atlantic — what (8) you call the Bell Atlantic order-taker has. It's a (9) special terminal set up for the

MACSTAR Centrex (10) functions and capabilities that's singularly used (11) for that, and the functions are narrowly oriented (12) to what that Centrex customer is able to do and (13) change. It's not like creating a service order; (14) it's more like doing a recent-change message.

(15) Q: But it's a computer terminal with a human (16) being at it.

(17) A: That's correct.

(18) Q: In that sense, it's the same as the Bell (19) Atlantic order-taker, which is also a human being (20) at a computer terminal.

(21) A: That piece is the same, yes.

(22) Q: And beyond that computer terminal, (23) everything moves electronically and changes the (24) functionality and the assignments out here in the

Page 142

(1) switch.

(2) A: For which situations?

(3) Q: Both.

(4) A: Sometimes. Not all the time.

(5) Q: When Bell Atlantic developed this (6) capability through the MACSTAR and the CCRS, the (7) reason the MACSTAR/CCRS step is in here — which is (8) where you deal with all of the security issues; is (9) that correct?

(10) MR. BEAUSEJOUR: Did you say when (11) Bell Atlantic developed the MACSTAR and CCRS (12) capability?

(13) MR. JONES: Strike that.

(14) Q: For purposes of this diagram, the (15) MACSTAR/CCRS, that's the place in the system where (16) the security issues you've talked about are dealt (17) with?

(18) A: Not completely. I think there's also (19) some security that's dealt with in the RMA\$ system, (20) also.

(21) Q: You think so. You're not sure.

(22) A: Not sure in connection with working with (23) the MACSTAR service. For our own employees that (24) use the RMA\$ system, there is security associated

Page 143

(1) with those.

(2) Q: I just want to be sure — I think this is (3) going to be redundant, and for that I apologize, (4) but I just want to be absolutely sure. Has either (5) NYNEX previously or Bell Atlantic currently (6) performed a business-case analysis in which it has (7) determined either the length of time or the cost (8) required to modify MACSTAR and/or CCRS to permit (9) CLEC access to the recent-change methodology (10) through that?

(11) A: And that's what I said we're work-

ing on (12) and we're not completed yet.

(13) Q: Has Bell Atlantic or previously NYNEX (14) performed a business-case analysis to determine the (15) cost and expense involved in modifying RMA\$ to (16) permit direct CLEC access to the recent-change (17) functionality?

(18) A: No.

(19) Q: The issue of concentration that you (20) talked about, Mr. Albert. Where in my —

(21) MR. LEVY: Contention, I think, was (22) the issue.

(23) MR. JONES: What did I say?

(24) MR. LEVY: Concentration.

Page 144

(1) MR. JONES: Thank you. I misspoke.

(2) Q: Contention; is that correct? Is that (3) because two things are contending for the same (4) space? Why is it called contention?

(5) A: They're contending for the attention and (6) the processing of the processor and the switch. (7) It's like if a million people were trying to talk (8) to you all at the same time, you wouldn't be able (9) to deal with that.

(10) Q: It's getting Shakespearean. I'm (11) envisioning all this turmoil and conflict going on (12) in MACSTAR and CCRS and RMA\$.

(13) MR. LEVY: Don't worry, all's well (14) that ends well.

(15) Q: Where does contention occur, primarily, (16) in MACSTAR or in RMA\$?

(17) A: Let me draw it for you. Right in at the (18) switch. And if you want to complete the picture —

(19) Q: Let me stop you there, just so I'm (20) clear. So contention is a function of what Bell (21) Atlantic for its own purposes is introducing into (22) the recent-change systems and what the Centrex (23) customers are introducing into the recent-change (24) system. Both of those contribute to contention.

Page 145

(1) A: That's correct. All of those are inputs (2) to the switch that it needs to contend with. There (3) are also, to give you the complete picture, also (4) Bell Atlantic functions that are done on terminals (5) into the recent change that also go straight into (6) the switch. These are primarily associated with (7) service orders.

(8) MR. LEVY: "These" meaning the RMA\$?

(9) THE WITNESS: The RMA\$ are primarily (10) associated with the service-order-driven (11) maintenance and repairs. Pair and rearrangement (12) and trunk-related functions come in, and

those are (13) also bidding contentionwise for messages to get (14) into the switch.

(15) Q: And when contention gets to be too big a (16) problem at a particular switch, what's the (17) solution?

(18) A: It slows down and doesn't process (19) messages.

(20) Q: And when it doesn't do that and it gets (21) over some Bell Atlantic threshold, what does Bell (22) Atlantic do about it?

(23) A: We have no fix.

(24) Q: You can't increase the switch capacity?

Page 146

(1) A: That would take development. I mean, (2) when we encounter it today with the current (3) limitations that exist, it just backs up, and if it (4) backs up a lot, then some messages will be lost. (5) Now, could development work be done to provide more (6) overall processor power and capacity? Yes.

(7) Q: It's a question of switch capacity, is it (8) not?

(9) A: It's development work in the switch, and (10) it's a function of the number and the types of (11) messages that are being handled by the switch.

(12) Q: Mr. Albert, let's try to be clear. Is (13) the purpose of development work in the switch to (14) increase the capacity of the switch?

(15) A: To increase the capacity and the ability (16) of the switch to handle and process recent-change- (17) type messages.

(18) Q: Sure.

(19) A: Yes.

(20) Q: So that's how you fix the problem when it (21) becomes too severe: You increase the appropriate (22) capacity of the switch.

(23) A: Right. That's what we would —

(24) MR. BEAUSEJOUR: Excuse me. Let the

Page 147

(1) witness answer, Mr. Jones.

(2) A: That's what we would have to have (3) development work done for, and that's what gets (4) into the time and the money to do those things (5) associated with creating this overall capability.

(6) Q: And when the capability was created for (7) Centrex customers, whatever development work at the (8) switch that was required in order to provide that (9) capability was performed at some point in time. Is (10) that a safe assumption?

(11) A: Yes, but you really need to qualify that, (12) because when the MACSTAR

and CCRS were first (13) created, it was 1AESSes that were the switches that (14) were being used and the Centrex customers were on. (15) Now we've got the digital switches, the 5ESSes from (16) Lucent, the DMS 100s from Nortel.

(17) Q: Whatever the switches were, sufficient (18) development work was done on them to provide (19) capacity necessary to give Centrex customers the (20) recent-change functionality. Is that a safe (21) assumption?

(22) A: Yes. And it wasn't development work so (23) that there were no problems as a result of it, but (24) it was development work that attempted to minimize

Page 148

(1) problems that came along as a result of it. As I (2) was describing, there are Centrexes today that have (3) much more — I mean switches today that have much (4) more than the typical amount of Centrex, and of (5) those customers, they've got more than a typical (6) amount of MACSTAR usages, and in ones of those (7) combinations in particular, we have had contention (8) problems with not having enough resources to handle (9) the messages. That's where we hit the backup in (10) the queue; and if they back up far enough then you (11) also start to get into error and lost-message (12) conditions.

(13) Q: And if you lose enough messages, you (14) increase the capacity of the switch; right?

(15) A: If you lose enough messages enough times, (16) yes.

(17) Q: If Bell Atlantic were required to choose (18) between providing the UNE platform to CLECs or (19) providing access, direct access, to its recent- (20) change functionality to CLECs, which would it (21) choose?

(22) A: I don't know.

(23) MR. JONES: I have no further (24) questions for Mr. Albert.

Page 149

(1) EXAMINATION

(2) BY MR. LEVY:

(3) Q: Is there a measure or a metric that (4) describes contention?

(5) A: Not that I'm aware of. We get queues of (6) particular sizes, but it's not like it's inches or (7) it's pounds or it's cubic feet. The measurements (8) that I encounter when we have difficulties are the (9) overall length of time to get a message through to (10) a switch. The ones where we've had problems, we've (11) been getting up into the four-hour, five-hour range (12) from when a message has been sent. So, for what I (13) have dealt with myself and experienced,

that's been (14) the primary indication of contention.

(15) Q: If there were no contention, how long (16) would a message have to wait?

(17) A: Fractions of seconds.

(18) Q: It would be virtually instantaneous.

(19) A: Yes.

(20) Q: At what point in the current system would (21) you deem — or how would you deem that contention (22) had gotten sufficiently bad that an upgrade of the (23) switch was necessary? Is there a metric that you (24) use that basically says, "This is the threshold."

Page 150

(1) It's gotten too bad. It's time to fix it?"

(2) A: No, that's more operational judgment, (3) from when is it encountered too frequently and when (4) is it enough of a problem to go to the vendors to (5) get them to do something about it.

(6) Q: And have there ever been circumstances (7) where you've done something about it on a switch in (8) Massachusetts?

(9) A: No, not that I'm aware of.

(10) Q: And the reason is that it's —

(11) A: I've only been responsible, working for (12) Massachusetts, since the merger. I've been (13) involved in cases in the C&P territories where (14) specific switches, we've gone back, some of the (15) ones we were talking about where we have problems, (16) to try and get fixes and improvements.

(17) Q: Were these switches that had the Centrex (18) capability built in?

(19) A: Yes.

(20) Q: At what point did you decide that things (21) were bad enough that there needed to be a fix?

(22) A: I think it was about the third time we (23) ran into contention that lasted more than an hour (24) on that switch. It's not a condition that you'd

Page 151

(1) design for or want to tolerate. When you (2) experience it, you want to get rid of it. It's not (3) like trunk-blockage, where you innately say you're (4) going to have some of it and here's an acceptable (5) level. Operationally, you can encounter it once or (6) twice and the world won't end, but you certainly (7) don't want to keep on operating that way every week (8) or every month or every year.

(9) Q: Wouldn't you conduct some kind of (10) business analysis to decide that it's worthwhile to (11) spend money on the fix?

(12) A: No, on a lot of operational pro-

blems, (13) it's to the point where it's not acceptable to have (14) it occur.

(15) Q: What's the "it"? An hour?

(16) A: This is where the subjective comes in. (17) My opinion would be, if you're encountering it once (18) a month, that's too much.

(19) Q: "It" meaning an hour?

(20) A: Backups on messages so that they're not (21) getting processed near-instantaneously.

(22) Q: So any backups? Before I thought you (23) were saying that if it was lasting an hour or so (24) that it was — maybe I misheard you — was

Page 152

(1) unacceptable.

(2) A: That was an example. That's when you'd (3) be getting to a degree where, yes, that's getting (4) pretty bad.

(5) Q: I'm really trying to ask you to inform me (6) a little bit more as to how and when you make the (7) business decision that you're getting too much (8) contention going into one of these switches. Are (9) you suggesting that if for (10) What are you suggesting?

(11) A: If you'd like, if you want something (12) beyond my own operational opinion, I can get that (13) from others and get that back to you as a record (14) request, if you'd like — if you want something (15) that would be more of a generality that would fit (16) for Massachusetts.

(17) Q: Let me try and frame the record request, (18) which will be No. 17, which would be to have you (19) provide us with recent examples in the Bell (20) Atlantic territory, broadly construed, in which the (21) kind of contention you've discussed here has (22) resulted in an upgrade to the switches in question (23) or some other fix; the measure of contention that (24) resulted in that decision; and the cost of the

Page 153

(1) fix. I'll rely on your judgment to provide two, (2) three, four, five, six examples, whatever you think (3) is appropriate — just to give us a sense of what (4) it takes to make the change. Is that clear?

(5) A: Yes.

(6) (RECORD REQUEST.)

(7) MS. EVANS: The RMAS system, does the (8) RMAS system have any kind of buffering (9) functionality that can slow messages down before (10) they go into the switch?

(11) THE WITNESS: Yes.

(12) MS. EVANS: Does the RMAS system know (13) when or is someone able to tell

the RMAS system (14) when the switch is too busy and messages need to be (15) slowed down?

(16) THE WITNESS: Yes, the switch will do (17) that. The switch will put up the caution flags (18) when it starts getting too busy.

(19) Why it gets difficult to describe and (20) what you wind up with, the resources that are being (21) drawn in the switch, where you get the contention (22) problems, they do more things than just process (23) recent-change messages. You know, you're (24) contending for the overall processing power within

Page 154

(1) the switch, which that processing power is also (2) used for processing calls. If the recent-change (3) messages are occurring at the time you're at your (4) peak busy-hour calling, you'll get different drains (5) on the resources.

(6) So the whole technical point of (7) contending for the resources in the switch has a (8) number of other factors besides just strictly the (9) messages piece of it.

(10) MS. EVANS: But the piece we're (11) discussing here is the possibility of increasing (12) the messages that come from RMAS because of CLEC (13) access to RMAS, is my understanding. Therefore, (14) we're not talking about increasing any other of (15) these pieces; here we're talking about the (16) possibility of increasing recent-moves-and-changes- (17) type messages to the switch.

(18) THE WITNESS: Yes, but where it gets (19) more complex is the resources in the switch that (20) are required to process those messages also are (21) used for many other things. They are used for the (22) maintenance functions in the switch. They are used (23) for the processing of live calls within the (24) switch. So part of the ability of a number of

Page 155

(1) messages for the switch to process also is then (2) influenced by all these other activities that are (3) going on that are also taking resources of the (4) processor.

(5) MS. EVANS: But as far as messages (6) going on the switch on recent changes, you have a (7) capability to slow those messages down when the (8) switch says, "Hey, I'm getting too busy. I can't (9) take this right now."

(10) THE WITNESS: Right.

(11) Q: Is there a way to prioritize the messages (12) coming through RMAS versus the maintenance kinds of (13) messages?

(14) A: Yes. Maintenance take a higher

priority (15) than service order.

(16) Q: So if there is contention, the service- (17) order changes will be the ones that are delayed.

(18) A: Maintenance wins out over service order. (19) Live call-processing wins out over maintenance.

(20) Q: Live call-processing is?

(21) A: The resources that you're contending for (22) in the switch, there are different degrees of what (23) will be serviced or handled next. The demand for (24) those resources driven by live call-processing is

Page 156

(1) the first priority in the hierarchy of demands on (2) the switch.

(3) Q: Let me modify my record request a little (4) bit. I think I left it a bit too general. First (5) of all, let's just focus on Bell Atlantic North, (6) previous NYNEX territory. And let's look at the (7) examples that would have occurred of these fixes to (8) the contention problem let's say within the last (9) year and a half or two years within that (10) territory.

(11) A: Okay.

(12) Q: Meaning all of them.

(13) A: Okay.

(14) Q: Unless I'm asking for hundreds. But it (15) sounds from your previous answer that they don't (16) occur too often, so that if I say for the last (17) period of time — I assume we'll see a number like (18) a dozen or so?

(19) A: I'm not sure what kind of records we keep (20) on them. I can certainly come up with examples. I (21) don't know if we've got good enough records that I (22) would say that this is an exhaustive search of all (23) the ones that have occurred.

(24) Q: Do your best. Thank you.

Page 157

(1) (RECORD REQUEST AMENDMENT.)

(2) MS. EVANS: One follow-up: Has Bell (3) Atlantic upgraded the RMAS system recently?

(4) THE WITNESS: I don't know what time (5) frame. The RMAS system, like other operations (6) systems, has different loads of software that are (7) developed and become available for it. When was (8) the last of those I'm not aware of.

(9) MR. LEVY: Mr. Jones, did you have (10) another one?

(11) MR. JONES: Could I ask a couple that (12) have occurred to me listening to this?

(13) MR. LEVY: Sure.

(14) CROSS-EXAMINATION

(15) BY MR. JONES:

(16) Q: Mr. Albert, I think you said that somehow (17) by permitting CLEC access to recent-change (18) functionality it would double the number of (19) recent-change orders flowing through the system. (20) Did I hear that?

(21) A: Recent-change messages that you'd have (22) for an order. You basically would have one (23) recent-change message if Bell Atlantic was doing (24) it. If you were having the CLEC turn the final

Page 158

(1) dial tone on, then you'd have a Bell Atlantic (2) message for setting up all the features and the (3) classes of service. You'd have then that second (4) CLEC message to say turn the dial tone on.

(5) Q: Let's assume we have a flow-through (6) scenario. We have a Bell Atlantic - Massachusetts (7) customer out there in the box behind Mr. (8) Beausjour's head now — this will really look good (9) on the record — and that customer terminates (10) service. Bell Atlantic's order-taker makes an (11) entry at the keyboard which, among other things, (12) sends a recent-change message through ultimately to (13) the switch to take dial tone off of that customer's (14) loop. Are you with me?

(15) A: Okay.

(16) Q: And maybe leaves on soft dial tone. For (17) my purposes it doesn't matter. So that's one (18) recent-change order that went through the recent- (19) change system; correct? To terminate that (20) customer's service.

(21) A: Yes. And to be precise, let's narrow it (22) and say it's a residential order and it's POTS (23) service. You get the more complicated orders, (24) there are going to be more than one recent-change

Page 159

(1) message that you need to activate then.

(2) Q: We're talking as simple as you can talk (3) here.

(4) A week later a new customer moves (5) into the same premises, orders service from Bell (6) Atlantic. The Bell Atlantic order-taker — and (7) it's POTS service — and the Bell Atlantic (8) order-taker makes the entry and everything flows (9) through the OSS's, including one recent-change (10) message that flows through to the switch and says, (11) "Turn that loop back on with dial tone." (12) Correct?

(13) A: All right, correct.

(14) Q: So we've had a recent-change message to (15) turn the service off, and we've had a recent-change (16) message to turn the service back on; right?

(17) A: Right.

(18) Q: Same scenario. Your customer has

moved (19) out. You've turned the system off with a single (20) recent-change message. A new customer moves in and (21) orders service from AT&T, and AT&T's order-taker (22) has the miracle of direct access, through either (23) MAC-STAR/CCRS or directly through RMAS, has direct (24) access into the recent-change system. AT&T sends

Page 160

(1) the same new-service order through those systems, (2) and the switch turns that customer's service back (3) on. Correct?

(4) A: Are we — are you going to be doing (5) recombining now?

(6) Q: I haven't done anything other than have a (7) Bell Atlantic customer move out and have Bell (8) Atlantic turn the service off. A new customer who (9) decides to be a CLEC customer comes back in — and (10) the CLEC has direct access to the recent-change (11) functionality. If that's the scenario, the CLEC (12) can order up the service for that new customer, the (13) POTS service, by sending a recent-change message (14) through to the switch; right?

(15) A: The way I think it would have to work is, (16) Bell Atlantic would have to do the recent-change (17) message to put the features on the line and to (18) establish the classes of service. I thought what (19) we were talking about with this new creation is (20) that then the CLEC would actually put the dial tone (21) on the line to activate it, which would be then the (22) second message.

(23) Q: So we're talking at least about two (24) different kinds of access to the recent-change. I

Page 161

(1) mean, in theory, at least, a CLEC could have access (2) to the recent-change functionality both to turn on (3) dial tone and to add features to the line; (4) correct?

(5) A: In theory you could develop probably just (6) about anything.

(7) Q: But my customer doesn't have any (8) features. My customer is just a plain-old- (9) telephone-service customer. And if that's all that (10) needs to be done and the CLEC has access to the (11) recent-change functionality, only one recent-change (12) message needs to get sent through to the switch. (13) Is that correct?

(14) A: No. You still need to change the class (15) of service. If you're providing that as an (16) unbundled switch port, which you would be in this (17) case, you still have to set the class of service (18) that way. That's established still through a (19) recent-change message that looks like a feature (20) message.

(21) Q: And in order to establish that class

of (22) service, a recent-change message has to be sent (23) through to the switch in order to do that?

(24) A: Yes.

Page 162

(1) Q: That's not just a billing function?

(2) A: No, that's setting the class of service (3) in the switch. When I'm talking class of service, (4) that's basically a defined set of parameters within (5) the switch that further defines characteristics of (6) that switch port. It does it in common. There (7) will be a number of services that have the same (8) class of service — flat-rate residence, measured (9) business. But it still sets and specifies a number (10) of parameters in common for those ports.

(11) Q: And is that a signal message that has to (12) get sent through when it's a new Bell Atlantic (13) customer signing up for service?

(14) A: That's why I said, if you take the very, (15) very simplistic case of let's have a residence and (16) let's have, you know — don't get exotic with the (17) features, and have it be POTS — there's usually (18) one recent-change message to establish that. Put (19) the telephone number on it.

(20) Q: That's in the case of a new Bell Atlantic (21) customer.

(22) A: Yes.

(23) Q: And you're telling us that if the new (24) customer is a CLEC customer ordering exactly the

Page 163

(1) same service, there are two recent-change (2) messages.

(3) A: That's because — that's correct, because (4) I think the process that we had described here was, (5) Bell Atlantic builds the unbundled switching in the (6) switch, and then the CLEC, to do the combining and (7) the crossover, comes along and turns the dial tone (8) on. That's the description I thought that we were (9) basically working with here.

(10) Q: No, no, no. Mr. Albert, I'm just trying (11) to get at a very simple scenario. The only thing (12) that's changed from what exists today is that the (13) CLEC has direct access to your recent-change (14) system, and the CLEC wants to turn on POTS service (15) for this customer. As things exist today, if the (16) CLEC has direct access to the recent-change (17) methodology, isn't it true that it does that with a (18) single recent-change message through to the switch, (19) the same as Bell Atlantic?

(20) A: Maybe I'm getting a little lost, because (21) we're hypothesizing here about what would be (22) created and what would be developed. If we're (23) saying for the CLEC —

you do things (2) in there that have an effect on further downstream (3) systems, I think that basically just happens in the (4) bulk of the security at that very head end, the (5) point of access.

(6) Q: So once I'm in, I'm in; is that correct?

(7) A: Yes, I think for the most part. And (8) again, that's not my particular in-depth area of (9) expertise. But if you want a generalization, I (10) think that applies.

(11) Q: I'd like to make a record request, (12) please. This has to do with the RMAS system and (13) what we were discussing before regarding recent (14) changes to the RMAS system. Could the company (15) identify and describe the changes-slash-upgrades to (16) the RMAS system made by the company or by the (17) company's vendors in the past two years. I'd also (18) like a dollar figure on the size of the change, (19) cost of the change.

(20) A: This will be upgrades from the vendors?

(21) Q: Any types of upgrades, whether it's done (22) by the company or by the company's vendors.

(23) A: Okay.

(24) MR. LEVY: That will be Record

Page 171

(1) Request 18.

(2) (RECORD REQUEST.)

(3) MR. LEVY: Redirect?

(4) MR. BEAUSEJOUR: Nothing.

(5) MS. BARBULESCU: I'd like to make one (6) additional record request. If I may, I'd like to (7) request that Bell Atlantic provide any data to (8) demonstrate whether or not Bell Atlantic in any of (9) its states that it's currently serving today, North (10) or South, uses any kind of loop-concentration (11) equipment in its network.

(12) MR. LEVY: Fine. That will be Record (13) Request 19.

(14) (RECORD REQUEST.)

(15) MR. LEVY: Thank you for your ten (16) minutes, Mr. Albert.

(17) MR. BEAUSEJOUR: I had ten minutes, (18) Mr. Levy.

(19) MR. LEVY: Are there other witnesses (20) in rebuttal at this point, or are we finished for (21) the day here, for either AT&T or MCI?

(22) MS. BARBULESCU: No, I have an (23) administrative item, though. We have not yet (24) received responses to the record requests that were

Page 172

(1) asked at the hearing two weeks ago.

(2) MR. BEAUSEJOUR: That's correct.

(3) MS. BARBULESCU: I wondered if there (4) was any update on when we will receive those?

(5) MR. BEAUSEJOUR: I believe by next (6) Wednesday.

(7) MR. LEVY: Thank you.

(8) I think the next order of business is (9) a briefing schedule. First, as I see it, the main (10) item for briefing at this point in the hearing, in (11) the consolidated arbitrations, is the following (12) question: Are Bell Atlantic's proposals with (13) regard to UNE combinations consistent with the (14) Department's March 13th order, and are there (15) alternative proposals which, while consistent with (16) the Department's order, might serve to better (17) accomplish the goals of the Act?

(18) MR. BEAUSEJOUR: While consistent (19) with the Department's order?

(20) MR. LEVY: Yes. (21) To me, that's the main question (22) before us. I would please ask the parties in (23) addressing that question to not reargue the issues (24) that were decided in the Department's previous

Page 173

(1) order.

(2) MR. JONES: On the responses to (3) record requests: Next Wednesday, including (4) today's?

(5) MR. BEAUSEJOUR: No, not today's, (6) most likely. But we'll try to expedite the (7) responses to today's.

(8) MR. JONES: Those are relevant to our (9) approach to briefing.

(10) MR. LEVY: Of course.

(11) MR. JONES: I'd like at least not to (12) today waive the possibility of having some limited (13) further interrogation. We will do everything we (14) can to avoid it; but not knowing what the responses (15) will contain....

(16) MR. LEVY: I anticipated that (17) request. I'm pleased you made it, because I was (18) going to mention it anyway.

(19) Assuming a week and a half or so for (20) information responses today?

(21) MR. BEAUSEJOUR: I was just told that (22) it's a big job. Can I report back next Tuesday on (23) the time frame?

(24) MR. LEVY: Let's do this.

Page 174

(1) WITNESS ALBERT: MCI's we can get (2) pretty fast. So I think it's no, there's nothing (3) out there.

(4) MS. BARBULESCU: But I'd like you to (5) check.

(6) MR. LEVY: On the assumption that the (7) record requests are responded to two weeks from (8) today, and on the further

assumption that no (9) further questioning is needed of the witnesses in (10) response to those record requests, I'd like to set (11) a briefing schedule for the initial briefs to be (12) due two weeks from that day — in other words, four (13) weeks from today — and reply briefs a week after (14) that.

(15) In the event there's a delay in the (16) response, we'll just push the briefing schedule (17) back day for day for each day of delay in response (18) to the record requests. Likewise, if we need to (19) hold another hearing, we'll reschedule all the (20) briefing at that point.

(21) Any questions, comments?

(22) MR. JONES: Maybe I just missed it. (23) Did you say anything about reply briefs?

(24) MR. LEVY: A week after. So absent

Page 175

(1) any changes, I'm anticipating briefs four weeks (2) from today, reply briefs five weeks from today. If (3) there's a delay in record responses, we'll have a (4) day-for-day delay in the briefing schedule, (5) allowing two weeks for the initial briefs from that (6) time and a week for the reply briefs from that.

(7) Anything else for today? You (8) probably all know what the other scheduled items (9) are. I'm waiting to hear from the CLECs as to when (10) they wish to begin the proceeding on dark-fiber (11) pricing.

(12) MS. BARBULESCU: Whenever.

(13) MR. JONES: I personally can't wait.

(14) (Laughter.)

(15) MR. LEVY: I actually think it was (16) Mr. Gruber for AT&T who was working on that when I (17) last raised the issue. I don't know if MCI was (18) going to pursue it.

(19) MS. BARBULESCU: We're pursuing it.

(20) MR. LEVY: And I think Teleport had (21) some interest in that, also. So if you could let (22) me know your schedule on that, I'd appreciate it.

(23) Thank you all very much for coming (24) today. I look forward to seeing you soon.

Page 176

(2:35 p.m.)
CERTIFICATE

I, Alan H. Brock, Registered Professional Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes taken on May 15, 1998.

Alan H. Brock
Registered Professional Reporter

Page 168

Page 165

Page 167

Page 169

Page 170

||| the system that you're accessing. If

In The Matter Of:

*DPU 96-73/74, 96-75, 96-80/81, 96-83, 96-94
Bell Atlantic - Arbitrations*

*Hearing Volume Number 33
May 1, 1998*

** FRITZ & SHEEHAN ASSOCIATES, INC. *
295 Devonshire Street
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 423-0500*

*Original File MAY01BEL.V1, 229 Pages
Min-U-Script® File ID: 3509828005*

Word Index included with this Min-U-Script®

Page 1

VOL. 33, PAGES 1-229
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND ENERGY
DPU 96-73/74
DPU 96-75
DPU 96-80/81
DPU 96-83
DPU 96-94

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING held at the Leverett
Saltonstall Building, 100 Cambridge Street, Boston,
Massachusetts, on May 1, 1998, commencing at 10:11
a.m., concerning:

BELL ATLANTIC - ARBITRATIONS

SITTING: Paul Levy, Arbitrator
Paul Vasington, Commissioner
Joan Foster Evans, Hearing Officer
Douglas Denny-Brown, Legal Division

APPEARANCES:

Bruce P. Beausejour, Esq.
New England Telephone & Telegraph Company
185 Franklin Street, Room 1403
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-1585
for New England Telephone & Telegraph Company
d/b/a Bell Atlantic - Massachusetts
Robert N. Werlin, Esq.
Keegan, Werlin & Pabian
21 Custom House Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
for New England Telephone & Telegraph Company
d/b/a Bell Atlantic - Massachusetts
Jeffrey F. Jones, Esq.
Kenneth W. Salinger, Esq.
Palmer & Dodge
One Beacon Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108
for AT&T Communications of New England
FRITZ & SHEEHAN ASSOCIATES, INC.
295 Devonshire Street, Boston, MA 02110
(617)423-0500

Page 2

Hope Barbulescu, Esq.
MCI Telecommunications Corporation
One International Drive
Rye Brook, New York 10573
Alan D. Mandl, Esq.
Ottenberg, Dunkleiss, Mandl & Mandl
260 Franklin Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
for MCI Telecommunications Corporation
Cathy Thurston, Esq.
Sprint Communications Company
1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 1110
Washington, D.C. 20036
INDEX

Testimony of:

PAULA L. BROWN, AMY STERN, BRYAN KENNEDY,
and DON ALBERT
37 by Mr. Levy
68 by Mr. Jones
122 by Ms. Barbulescu
PAULA L. BROWN, AMY STERN, and DON ALBERT
127 by Mr. Jones
144 by Ms. Barbulescu
PAULA L. BROWN and DON ALBERT
146 by Mr. Jones
186 by Ms. Evans
189 by Mr. Levy
190 by Ms. Barbulescu
193 by Mr. Mandl
JAMES O. CARLSON
219 by Mr. Levy
223 by Commissioner Vasington
224 by Mr. Levy
227 by Mr. Beausejour

Page 3

Bell Atlantic Combinations Exhibits
2 6
AT&T Combinations Exhibits
3 77
Combinations Record Requests
1 50
2 60
3 62
4 87
5 89
6 94
7 100
8 119

9 151
10 185
11 192
12 192
13 194
14 209
Recesses: 59, 127, 186

Page 4

(1) May 1, 1998 10:11 a.m.

(2) PROCEEDINGS

(3) **MR. LEVY:** Good morning. This is the
(4) consolidated arbitrations, Bell Atlantic
and (5) Sprint, MCI, AT&T, Brooks Fiber,
and Teleport. The (6) main topic for
today's hearing is the issue of (7) un-
bundled-network-element provisioning,
which comes (8) out of an order issued by
the Department on March (9) 13th, 1998,
in which the Department requested (10)
parties to resume negotiations to see
whether (11) resolution of the issue of
UNE combinations could (12) be agreed
upon and report back regarding the
status (13) of those discussions. Based on
the reports back, (14) it was determined
that it would be appropriate to (15) enter
an evidentiary phase of this proceeding.
(16) Sitting with me today are (17) Com-
missioner Paul Vasington and Joan Fos-
ter Evans, (18) from the legal division of
the Department.

(19) First on a scheduling issue regarding
(20) OSS/NRC rebuttal testimony sub-
mitted by Bell (21) Atlantic: The parties
have met informally and have (22) revised
the schedule for that testimony. (23)
Information requests will be due from
the CLECs to (24) Bell Atlantic on May
19th, responses from Bell

Page 5

(1) Atlantic by May 29th, and hearings
scheduled at (2) which the Bell Atlantic
witnesses will be examined (3) on June
9th and June 10th.

(4) Let's start with today's proceeding. (5)
We've had a number of submissions by
the parties. (6) We'll mark them as we go
along. Let's start first (7) with Bell Atlan-
tic. Mr. Beausejour?

(8) **MR. BEAUSEJOUR:** Good morning,
Mr. (9) Levy. On April 17th Bell Atlantic
filed its (10) position statement pursuant
to the Department's (11) directives in this
matter. Today we have four (12) witnesses
who are available to answer questions
(13) concerning the position statement.
They are Paula (14) Brown, Amy Stern,
Donald Albert, and Bryan (15) Kennedy.

(16) I would like to have them appear as a
(17) panel. I think that would be the most
efficient (18) way to go about that. Three
of the witnesses have (19) brief opening
statements they would like to make.

(20) So at this point I'd mark the Bell (21)
Atlantic position statement as Bell Atlan-
tic Combo (22) Exhibit No. 2. We had
previously marked an exhibit (23) at the
hearing on December 16th.

(24) **MR. LEVY:** Fine. We'll call that

Page 6

(1) Bell Atlantic Combinations 2, and this
is the April (2) 17th submission by the
company.

(3) **MR. BEAUSEJOUR:** That's correct.

(4) (Exhibit Bell Atlantic Combinations 2
(5) marked for identification.)

(6) **MR. BEAUSEJOUR:** I now ask that the
(7) witnesses go to the conference table
at the front (8) of the hearing room.

(9) **PAULA L. BROWN, AMY STERN, (10)**
BRYAN KENNEDY, and DON ALBERT,
Sworn (11) **MR. LEVY:** Could we have
everyone's (12) name in order.

(13) **WITNESS BROWN:** Paula Brown.

(14) **WITNESS STERN:** Amy Stern.

(15) **WITNESS KENNEDY:** Bryan
Kennedy.

(16) **WITNESS ALBERT:** I'm Don Albert.

(17) **MR. LEVY:** And perhaps just for the
(18) record you could each state what
your position is (19) with the company. I
know these things change over (20) time.
We want to stay up to date.

(21) **WITNESS BROWN:** My name is Paula
L. (22) Brown. I'm vice-president, re-
gulatory, for Bell (23) Atlantic.

(24) **WITNESS STERN:** My name is Amy

Page 7

(1) Stern. I'm director of product man-
agement for (2) unbundled wholesale
elements.

(3) **WITNESS KENNEDY:** Bryan Kennedy,
(4) CON-X Corporation, vice-president,
client (5) services.

(6) **WITNESS ALBERT:** And my name is
Don (7) Albert. I'm network services
director of cocarrier (8) impl. mentation.

(9) **MR. LEVY:** Thank you.

(10) **MR. BEAUSEJOUR:** Thank you, Mr.
(11) Levy. Ms. Brown will be the first
witness to have (12) an opening statem-
ent.

(13) **WITNESS BROWN:** Good morning.
As I (14) stated, I'm Paula L. Brown, and I'm
vice-president (15) for regulatory for Bell
Atlantic - Massachusetts. (16) I've testified
before the Department in numerous (17)
proceedings and in this arbitration. I'm
here (18) today to respond to the ques-
tions about the (19) company's position
statement regarding UNE access (20) that
was filed with the Department on April
17th.

(21) The company's position statement
(22) contains a comprehensive proposal
that has two (23) principal parts. First,
although the company is (24) not re-
quired by the Act to combine UNEs for
CLECs

Page 8

[1] and cannot be compelled to do so, it has [2] voluntarily proposed to provide certain UNE [3] combinations. For instance, the company proposes a [4] switched subplatform that consists of the port and [5] access to shared and dedicated transport for [6] interoffice and interexchange access transport, [7] access to signaling, access to 911, E911 transport [8] and tandems, and access to BA-Mass. operator [9] services and direct-assistance UNEs.

[10] In addition, the company proposes to [11] combine voice-grade analog link UNEs with [12] interoffice transport UNEs. This set of combined [13] UNEs will enable a CLEC to obtain voice-grade [14] analog links without the need to collocate in each [15] Bell Atlantic central office in Massachusetts. The [16] combinations that the company is voluntarily [17] offering are substantial and promote competition.

[18] Second, the company is proposing [19] options to its existing physical collocation [20] offering to enable CLECs to combine UNEs at a lower [21] costs. These options include minicages, sharing of [22] cages, virtual collocation, and an assembly room.

[23] The company believes that these [24] offerings exceed our requirements for

Page 9

[1] interconnection under Section 251 of the [2] Telecommunications Act, which we call "the Act," [3] and exceed our 271 obligations. Ms. Stern is [4] available to answer questions concerning these [5] offerings.

[6] The company is not proposing to [7] provide the so-called UNE platform combination, [8] which consists principally of a UNE link and UNE [9] local switching. Contrary to the claims of others, [10] the UNE platform is simply a substitute for the [11] resale of BA-Mass.'s retail service. Because of [12] the different pricing standards in the Act for UNEs [13] and resale, the price for the UNE platform is lower [14] than for resale and provides a clear case of [15] uneconomic arbitrage.

[16] Indeed, the Eighth Circuit Court of [17] Appeals recognized the arbitrage inherent in UNE [18] combinations when it stated, and I quote, "To [19] permit such an acquisition of already-combined [20] elements at cost-based rates for unbundled access [21] would obliterate the careful distinctions Congress [22] has drawn in Subsections 251(c)(3) and (4) between [23] access to unbundled network elements, on the one [24] hand, and the purchase of wholesale rates of an

Page 10

[1] incumbent's telecommunications re-

tail services for [2] resale, on the other." End quote.

[3] In addition to being inconsistent [4] with the Act, the company believes that the [5] provision of UNE platform is inconsistent with the [6] policy of the Department to provide competition [7] founded upon sound economic principles. The [8] Department has taken care in numerous decisions to [9] ensure that similar services are priced in a [10] similar manner and to avoid creating artificial [11] advantages for one class of competitor.

[12] Moreover, claims that the UNE [13] platform are necessary for CLECs to distinguish [14] their offering from BA-Mass.'s offerings are [15] exaggerated. With resale, CLECs can combine or [16] repackage BA-Mass. retail offerings in numerous [17] ways — for example, vertical features could be [18] combined in various packages and usage services [19] could be recombined or repriced.

[20] CLECs have also claimed that they [21] could develop new services using UNEs that take [22] advantage of features that BA-Mass. may not provide [23] in its retail offerings. It may be possible to [24] develop other offerings by UNEs, but development of

Page 11

[1] new offerings is not contingent upon the offering [2] of UNE platform. Those offerings could be [3] developed with UNEs that are recombined by the [4] CLEC.

[5] The company's proposal permits the [6] CLECs to recombine elements in a variety of ways, [7] and contrary to the claims of others, do not [8] degrade service.

[9] Mr. Albert will respond to questions [10] regarding the quality of service using the [11] company's proposed offerings versus UNE platforms. [12] Within the company's proposals are ways for CLECs [13] to combine UNEs either remotely or with a minimal [14] effort. Equipment that will permit remote [15] connection will be explained by Mr. Kennedy.

[16] Finally, in its comments filed on [17] April 17th, AT&T attached New York Telephone's [18] prefiling statement for its 271 proceeding. The [19] company has not proposed the UNE-P arrangements with [20] glue fees that were agreed upon and described in [21] New York Telephone's prefiling statement. The [22] agreement reached in New York was a comprehensive [23] agreement resolving many issues. The company has [24] voluntarily committed to many requirements in

Page 12

[1] return for New York Commission

support of its 271 [2] filing application with the FCC.

[3] That agreement strikes a balance [4] between the interests of facility-based carriers [5] that have invested in the infrastructure in New [6] York and the interests of other CLECs that desire [7] to purchase UNEs for end-to-end service. The [8] company views the agreement as the culmination of [9] long negotiations to resolve issues surrounding the [10] 271 petition and not the resolution of any 251 [11] requirements, as in this proceeding.

[12] In summary, BA-Mass.'s proposal is [13] reasonable and should be accepted by the [14] Department. The combinations which are proposed [15] reduce the number of individual UNEs that a CLEC [16] must assemble for itself and will eliminate the [17] need for a CLEC to collocate in each BA-Mass. end [18] office to obtain certain link UNEs. In addition, [19] the company has proposed various alternatives for [20] CLECs to combine individual UNEs through reasonable [21] and cost-effective means. Thank you.

[22] MR. BEAUSEJOUR: Mr. Levy, Ms. Stern [23] is the next witness that has an opening statement.

[24] WITNESS STERN: My name is Amy

Page 13

[1] Stern. I testified in this proceeding on December [2] 16th, 1997. The purpose of my statement is to [3] comment on the testimony of Annette S. Guariglia on [4] behalf of MCI and to demonstrate that the [5] alternatives BA is offering CLECs for combining [6] elements promote competition and go beyond the [7] requirements of the Act.

[8] BA-Massachusetts's position statement [9] sets forth significant practical and specific [10] proposals for voluntary arrangements. BA's [11] extended-link proposal would permit a CLEC to gain [12] access to unbundled links to connect to the CLEC's [13] switch at its option, either without any [14] collocation or with as little as a single [15] collocation node in each LATA in which it chooses [16] to purchase unbundled links.

[17] BA's proposal goes beyond the [18] requirements of the Act because BA is voluntarily [19] combining separate loops and unbundled network [20] elements.

[21] MR. LEVY: Excuse me. Could you just [22] repeat two sentences before that, where you said [23] something about a single collocation per LATA?

[24] WITNESS STERN: Sure. The extended-

Page 14

[1] link proposal would permit a CLEC to gain access to [2] unbundled links to connect to the CLEC's switch at [3] its

option, either without any collocation or with [4] as little as a single collocation node in each LATA [5] in which it chooses to purchase unbundled links.

[6] MR. LEVY: Thank you.

[7] WITNESS STERN: BA's proposal goes [8] beyond the requirements of the Act, because BA is [9] voluntarily combining separate loops and unbundled [10] network elements. Specifically, BA has offered to [11] combine unbundled loops and unbundled interoffice [12] facilities so the CLEC can aggregate end-user [13] customers from any central office throughout the [14] LATA without collocating and bring them back to the [15] CLEC's switch. Under this offering BA will not [16] allow the CLEC to connect an extended-link service [17] to a Bell Atlantic switch. To do so would be to [18] recreate another form of the UNE platform.

[19] This offering was designed to make it [20] easier and less expensive for CLECs which own their [21] own switches to reach more customers, thereby [22] promoting facilities-based competition.

[23] BA's switching-platform offering also [24] minimizes collocation requirements for CLECs that

Page 15

[1] choose to provide service using BA's unbundled [2] network elements. The switched subplatform helps [3] CLECs that have loop facilities but choose to use [4] Bell Atlantic's switch and other network elements [5] behind the switch. For example, a cable or [6] wireless loop provider may collocate to connect its [7] loops to a Bell Atlantic switch, but the switched [8] subplatform, contrary to Ms. Guariglia's [9] allegations, is also useful to a CLEC that chooses [10] to offer service entirely by using BA's unbundled [11] network elements.

[12] Again, it is true that a CLEC would [13] need to assemble the link and the local-switching [14] network elements, but through the switch [15] subplatform, Bell Atlantic would combine the [16] additional elements that the CLEC uses behind the [17] switch, such as interoffice transport, shared or [18] dedicated, to either Bell Atlantic, to other CLECs, [19] to interexchange carriers or other carriers, [20] connections to operator services, directory [21] assistance, 911 platforms, STPs, et cetera, in the [22] network.

[23] With respect to Bell Atlantic's [24] virtual collocation proposal, contrary to MCI's

Page 16

[1] contention, there is equipment available that will [2] permit a CLEC to remotely cross-connect link and [3] port UNEs. CON-X is a vendor which has the

type of [4] equipment referred to, and Mr. Kennedy is here [5] today to answer questions concerning the [6] equipment.

[7] In addition, Lucent is actively [8] marketing a piece of equipment that performs these [9] functions as well. It is the DACS 2ISX. Lucent is [10] also working on another piece of equipment that [11] performs this function, which it is planning to [12] release in 1999.

[13] With respect to MCI's claims about [14] the superiority of UNE platform over resale, MCI is [15] simply trying to get resale services at a much less [16] expensive UNE price. MCI claims that if it is [17] limited to resale, no innovation will occur in the [18] marketplace. This is not true. MCI does not have [19] to merely mimic Bell Atlantic's services when they [20] choose resale as the means to purchase wholesale [21] services from Bell Atlantic. They are still free [22] to provide creative alternatives to the marketplace [23] by using different pricing plans as a major [24] marketing tool. For example, they could have

Page 17

[1] different term-commitment discount plans, different [2] prices when you buy additional vertical features, [3] free direct listings, et cetera.

[4] Furthermore, MCI's witness grossly [5] exaggerates the difference between UNE and resale, [6] implying that resale is more complex and [7] restrictive operationally than UNE. For example, [8] Ms. Guariglia implies at Page 25 of her direct [9] testimony that there are multiple OSS's, ordering [10] and provisioning complexities, and restrictions [11] associated with resale that are not present with [12] UNE. Either the point is unclear or it is [13] incorrect. Each service has resale, and UNE has a [14] set of ordering and provisioning guidelines and [15] systems that may vary, depending on the service [16] requested, but the resale ordering and provisioning [17] procedures are no more complex, restrictive, or [18] difficult to control than are those for the UNE [19] services.

[20] Ms. Guariglia gives other examples of [21] so-called differences between UNE platform and [22] resale, claiming that with UNE platform the CLEC [23] can pick the points of interconnection and make [24] network design and engineering decisions. This is

Page 18

[1] not true, either. Whether the CLEC buys resale or [2] UNE platform, Bell Atlantic routes the CLEC's [3] traffic in the same manner as it routes its own [4] traffic, so the CLEC has no more control and [5] network management responsibility under the UNE [6] platform than it does under resale.

[7] Finally, in the event the CLEC still [8] finds that UNE platform is the way it wants to go, [9] because of some real or perceived advantage, it is [10] free to combine the link to the switch platform and [11] transport through the Bell Atlantic assembly-room [12] proposal. This alternative will be more economical [13] than traditional collocation, because the CLEC does [14] not have to pay for room construction or cage [15] construction. It has only to pay for the [16] terminations and connections between the Bell [17] Atlantic main distributing frame and the assembly- [18] room termination bay, plus any ancillary expenses [19] such as room or frame security.

[20] Furthermore, in spite of MCI's [21] claims, they have not provided any evidence that [22] additional cross-connections will lead to inferior [23] service. In fact, within the Bell Atlantic network [24] there are many large, complex central offices where

Page 19

[1] our own customers' lines have extra cross-connects [2] just to get from one part of the central office to [3] another, and service is not degraded in any [4] respect.

[5] That concludes my statement.

[6] MR. BEAUSEJOUR: Mr. Levy, Mr. Albert [7] has an opening statement. Before he begins, I'd [8] just ask him to provide just a brief summary of his [9] work experience.

[10] WITNESS ALBERT: Good morning. My [11] name is Don Albert. The title I gave when I first [12] introduced myself, that basically means I'm the [13] engineering and operations person. And [14] occasionally they let me wipe the mud off my shoes [15] and actually appear in public.

[16] I've got 20 years' experience in the [17] telecommunications industry. I'm an engineering [18] graduate from Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, [19] Virginia. My 20 years have been with C&P Telephone [20] and with Bell Atlantic. During that time I've had [21] jobs in engineering, a number of jobs in [22] engineering, in operations, in network planning, [23] and a very brief period in sales.

[24] The current position I'm in I've been

Page 20

[1] in for two years, since just right before the [2] passage of the Telecommunications Act. For the [3] first 18 years of my career, I never testified [4] anywhere, and for the last two years, as I've [5] worked with implementing and developing unbundling, [6] collocation, and interconnection arrangements, in [7] my position the last couple of years I've testified [8] in local competition pro-

ceedings and arbitrations [9] in Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, DC, Delaware, [10] New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. So that's briefly [11] the background.

[12] The things I'd like to address: In [13] developing our proposal that Ms. Stern talked [14] about, we did look at a number of alternatives. [15] What we considered were some of the alternatives [16] suggested by Mr. Falcone in the previous hearings, [17] as well as one that was suggested by MCI in their [18] testimony.

[19] For those different alternatives, the [20] first one, which would be a completely electronic [21] main distributing frame for connecting loops and [22] ports, this arrangement would work. The CLECs [23] could place this equipment through either physical [24] or virtual collocation. However, vendors have not

Page 21

[1] yet completed development work on a completely [2] electronic main distributing frame. That's mainly [3] because there haven't been a whole lot of CLECs [4] pushing them to do that.

[5] However, there is a better, existing, [6] more cost-effective answer, and that is the [7] equipment manufactured by CON-X, that Mr. Kennedy [8] can describe. That equipment is a combination of [9] mechanical and computer-controlled equipment.

[10] The next alternative, I think AT&T [11] described it as logical unbundling. This was using [12] the recent change capabilities of the switch or [13] using the existing recent-change systems that allow [14] Centrex customers to make some limited recent [15] changes.

[16] First, I'd like to say, this really [17] is not the combining of a loop to a switch port. [18] It basically preassumes that the two are connected [19] together. What it is is a method of activating in [20] the switch, switching service.

[21] Now, I suppose it would be possible [22] to develop that type of an agreement that AT&T has [23] described. Probably given enough time and enough [24] money, you could develop a solar-powered car. But

Page 22

[1] to make these changes to the switch recent-change [2] systems for activating switching service, there [3] really are a number of technical challenges that [4] are presented. First, in Massachusetts, there are [5] two different systems that we used to do for [6] Centrex customers making limited changes to their [7] services.

[8] Those two systems talk to two [9] different types of switching machines. To do the [10] development work that would be required, the first [11] major

hurdle would be that of security and [12] partitioning, work that would enable CLECs to reach [13] and control all lines within the switch and to have [14] them be able to do that in a multicarrier [15] environment. With the recent-change Centrex [16] arrangements today, it's a very limited arrangement [17] of just Centrex lines that can be accessed.

[18] The other technical challenge would [19] be just the remote access capabilities are [20] currently limited. They would involve difficulties [21] with queueing and with contention that would have [22] to be addressed, that would exist if the two [23] systems that we use in Massachusetts — I didn't [24] mention them earlier, but it's MACSTAR and CCRS;

Page 23

[1] those are the two Centrex customer rearrangement [2] centering. The queue and the contention of those [3] would need to be developed and addressed.

[4] There's an additional longer-term [5] issue with switch memory administration that would [6] have to be dealt with. And then, in addition to [7] the development work within the switch and within [8] the MACSTAR and CCRS systems, we also have to do [9] development work in systems that they interface to [10] to take care of functions related to ordering and [11] provisioning and to billing. Now, all that work [12] would be required. Again, enough time, enough [13] money, I suppose it could be done, but it's not [14] cheap, it's not fast.

[15] The next alternative — and I guess [16] these are probably two combined together — it was [17] third-party access, developing Massachusetts main [18] distributing frames, or escorted access. There are [19] a number of problems that these would present. The [20] first is a major problem with security, and [21] security involved in a multicarrier environment.

[22] Today, in Bell Atlantic - [23] Massachusetts, only Bell Atlantic - Massachusetts [24] employees install equipment and make connections in

Page 24

[1] our central offices.

[2] **MR. LEVY:** Excuse me, Mr. Albert. [3] Could you just explain more specifically what [4] you're talking about here? You used a term at the [5] beginning of this paragraph and then started to [6] explain that there are security problems. But [7] please define a little bit better what you're [8] actually talking about.

[9] **WITNESS ALBERT:** Third-party access [10] would be if an outside company were hired to make [11] connections between Bell Atlantic's unbundled loops [12] and switch ports, to run those

connections within [13] Bell Atlantic's central office on Bell Atlantic's [14] main distributing frame. So third-party access [15] would involve employees from an outside company [16] that would come in and would make those connections [17] on behalf of all CLECs.

[18] **MR. LEVY:** So you're not talking [19] about a situation in which mounted on the Bell [20] Atlantic frame would be termination equipment owned [21] by the CLECs.

[22] **WITNESS ALBERT:** No, not yet.

[23] **MR. LEVY:** Is that next?

[24] **WITNESS ALBERT:** That's coming up.

Page 25

[1] That's part of the hit parade.

[2] **MR. LEVY:** So this is just a [3] discussion of permitting someone other than a Bell [4] Atlantic person to make the connections on the Bell [5] Atlantic frame.

[6] **WITNESS ALBERT:** That's correct.

[7] **MR. LEVY:** Thank you.

[8] **WITNESS ALBERT:** And when I said [9] third-party access or escorted access, that was [10] what I was describing. In addition, the third- [11] party access/escorted access, that would also lead [12] to the high probability for the potential for labor [13] problems.

[14] Finally, Bell Atlantic would lose [15] accountability for the service quality that we [16] provide to our own end users and to CLECs. If [17] there were other individuals making connections or [18] running jumpers on Bell Atlantic's equipment, Bell [19] Atlantic's frames, those common equipments, those [20] systems, those serve our own users, those serve [21] special services, 911's, other CLECs — it would be [22] impossible to tell if work performed by a third [23] party actually created problems in those other [24] services.

Page 26

[1] So where we are on the hook in some [2] cases financially for the grade of service, [3] problems would be inserted, and we really — we [4] lose accountability in those for Bell Atlantic- [5] caused or caused by others.

[6] Next, Mr. Falcone talked about taking [7] the blocks, the cross-connect blocks — this is [8] what you were mentioning earlier — and moving them [9] someplace that would be closer to the distributing [10] frame for the CLEC to run connections on. That [11] concept is really what began the evolution for the [12] assembly-room proposal that we have developed. The [13] aspect of having a secure, standardized arrangement [14] that all CLECs could use in a multicarrier

[15] environment that would be potentially closer to the [16] distributing frame, that is all wrapped up with the [17] assembly room. And all could be done without CLECs [18] having to have individual physical collocation [19] cages.

[20] The next option, MCI, in their [21] testimony, they described an arrangement that was [22] kind of like an alternative to extended link. This [23] was an arrangement that used GR-303 equipment. I'd [24] like to say first, this is not a combination of

Page 27

[1] existing network elements, this GR-303 [2] alternative. Extended link, as proposed by Bell [3] Atlantic, combines the unbundled loop and unbundled [4] transport. Now, GR-303 would combine loop, it [5] would combine transport, and it would combine a [6] hunk of GR-303 equipment that is not a network [7] element.

[8] The next thing I'd like to say is, we [9] do not use in Bell Atlantic - Massachusetts's [10] network GR-303 equipment. We do not have current [11] plans to use that. GR-303 equipment does both [12] transport and switching functions.

[13] Now, this arrangement that MCI is [14] proposing, it would also be defining a new [15] structure for network elements, a structure that [16] would be inconsistent with the approach that the [17] FCC has taken for defining network elements in [18] their 96-98 rules. Now, if MCI wants to do this [19] arrangement that they've proposed, that we don't do [20] in our network today, they could do it, and they [21] could do it through physical or through virtual [22] collocation, if they desired.

[23] Our proposal with extended link [24] provides service exactly as we do today for our own

Page 28

[1] end users. The extended-link service for CLECs [2] would take loop and transport and combine them [3] together exactly as Bell Atlantic does today for [4] services that we provide to our own retail users.

[5] Our proposal for extended link is [6] reasonable, it's consistent with the structure of [7] the existing network elements, and the offering is [8] not a limiting offering in any effect that MCI has [9] portrayed it to be. It is in fact how we combine [10] those elements today for our own end users.

[11] Finally, I'd like to address a couple [12] of items on the aspect of service-quality issues. [13] The first was just this whole topic about [14] additional connections and the effect that [15] additional connections may or may not have. The [16]

telephone network today is basically a series of [17] all types of connections, a 'large number of [18] connections. There's a great variability that [19] exists from one circuit to the next circuit in [20] terms of the number of connections that that [21] circuit has. This number of connections, this [22] variable that exists in our network today, does not [23] have an effect on service quality. You could have [24] a loop in an apartment building that had many, many

Page 29

[1] more connections than a loop that was in a [2] high-rise office building right next door to it. [3] In one case versus the other, there are not more or [4] less problems, there are not differences with [5] transmission quality.

[6] Another example is, take the example [7] of making a local call. If you're going to make a [8] local call across town, you could easily go through [9] 30 different connections to complete that call. [10] Whereas if you were to make a call from your office [11] to San Francisco, a long-distance call, you might [12] go through 70 or 100 connections that the network [13] is made up of. Those two different calls, there is [14] no difference in quality, no difference in the [15] service that's provided.

[16] Now, Mr. Falcone, he and I have [17] followed each other around from Maryland to New [18] Jersey to here on this topic, and I know that he [19] has said that he's worked on a frame running [20] jumpers, and I have also worked on a frame doing [21] that myself. He mentioned at one point about [22] solder connections. Those were used a long time [23] ago, and we don't use those any more. What we do [24] use today on our frame to make connections —

Page 30

[1] actually, it's kind of neat. There's a little gun, [2] and inside this gun we put the cross-connect wire, [3] and then there's a steel pin on the frame that the [4] gun shoots down onto, and it wraps the wire around [5] that pin seven times.

[6] Now, when you've done that, those [7] don't pull off, and those don't come off. If you [8] listen to AT&T and MCI, they've tried to create [9] this great mystery surrounding our cross-connects; [10] but in reality, if you look at modern central- [11] office cross-connects, they don't pull off, they're [12] very reliable, and they're not prone to failure.

[13] Now, to address the topic of the [14] number of connections and the quality and does it [15] cause more troubles — rather than talking about a [16] lot of theory, I think the best fact that I can [17] provide that those — that the number of [18] connections don't cause more troubles

is the actual [19] experience that we've had in Massachusetts with [20] unbundled loops. All other things being equal, if [21] you look at the connections that are required to [22] hook up an unbundled loop to a CLEC, and if you [23] contrast that to the connections that are required [24] to provide other services to our own users, the

Page 31

[1] trouble-report rate for the loop and its [2] connections for unbundled loops compared to the [3] trouble-report rate we're actually experiencing for [4] the loop and its connections for our own retail [5] services — the unbundled loop has more [6] connections; however, the actual trouble-report [7] rate that we're experiencing for the — it's a base [8] of about 2,500 unbundled loops in Massachusetts, [9] that's running roughly half of what the [10] trouble-report rate is running for the retail [11] services. And in this case, the arrangements and [12] the methods and the cross-connects for the [13] unbundled loops, generally, all other things being [14] equal, have had more connections.

[15] The next service-quality issue was [16] one relating to testing. AT&T and MCI were saying [17] testing is more complicated, it's more difficult [18] with the arrangements that we've proposed. This is [19] not true. Testing is pretty straightforward under [20] any of these alternatives. Basically, for testing [21] for combinations, the CLEC has access to the test [22] system MLT, mechanized loop testing. It's up to [23] the CLEC then to basically say the trouble is in [24] the switch, the trouble is inside in the central

Page 32

[1] office, or the trouble is outside in the loop.

[2] Now, to make that identification, to [3] do testing down to that degree, it doesn't make any [4] difference if you're talking about an assembly room [5] or if you're talking about combination through [6] collocation or if you're talking about our regular [7] retail services. The testing identification works [8] equally the same, same and as well, in all those [9] conditions.

[10] The third item under service quality [11] talked about was the effect on loop length; or, I [12] think more specifically, the aspect of, for doing [13] combinations, if we put in tie cables to connect [14] collocation, the fact that that will actually make [15] the loop somewhat longer, because of the added [16] links within the central office.

[17] There I'd like to say, the length of [18] the tie cables does not and has not affected [19] performance. The loop designs that we employ in [20] our

network were developed to accommodate [21] variations in length. If you have a high-rise [22] office building, the loop that is on the first [23] floor compared to the loop that may be on the 20th [24] floor, there is a greater distance and variation

Page 33

[1] there in length than what we run into with the tie [2] cables in our central offices.

[3] So the design for the loops is geared [4] and set up to accommodate variation in length. The [5] slightly additional lengths from the tie cables to [6] collocation basically have no effect on design or [7] performance.

[8] I guess the bottom line, however, is [9] that Bell Atlantic guarantees or has specifications [10] for what our unbundled loops will perform to [11] technically, and we're on the hook to make sure [12] that every unbundled loop we deliver meets those [13] technical specifications.

[14] The final item under service quality [15] is the aspect of service disruptions. There, it is [16] true, to cut over an existing customer to an [17] unbundled loop or to cut over an existing customer [18] to a combination through collocation of a loop and [19] a switch port that the CLEC would combine, there is [20] a period where briefly you actually have to pick up [21] the wires and move them from Bell Atlantic dial [22] tone over to CLEC dial tone. Now, while that [23] occurs, while those wires are being picked up, [24] during that period the customer has no dial tone.

Page 34

[1] However, we have developed the [2] methods and procedures for doing coordinated [3] cutovers for unbundled loops through collocation. [4] The procedures that we have developed and used to [5] actually cut over more than 40,000 unbundled loops [6] in the Bell Atlantic region, those procedures for [7] doing unbundled loops basically are the same [8] procedures and arrangements for doing coordinated [9] cutovers that we would use for combinations that [10] the CLEC would do through collocation.

[11] Now, these methods and procedures [12] that we have developed and that we have proven with [13] the cutovers that we have done, basically they're [14] designed to minimize what that disruption is. [15] They're designed to have a majority of all of the [16] work done in advance, and only that final step of [17] picking up the wires and moving them over is when [18] the disruption occurs. On average, for the [19] cutovers that we are doing, that's been running [20] under 10 minutes.

[21] Now, we do cutovers throughout our [22] network. It's part of the daily business. We do [23] cutovers from Centrex to PBX. We do cutovers from [24] PBX's to Centrexes. We do cutovers for special

Page 35

[1] circuits. We do cutovers for special switches. We [2] do cutovers for other customers. All of the [3] comments from the CLECs about we've got these [4] cutovers and we've got lots of connections and it's [5] all — you know, this and that, that's part of the [6] job. There's nothing high-tech about connecting to [7] the wires. We make lots of connections. We [8] connect lots of wires. We do it every day, and [9] we're real good at it. It's as basic and as simple [10] as brushing your teeth. The cutovers that we do [11] for unbundled loops, the cutovers that we would do [12] for combinations, that's part of the job.

[13] However, with the cutovers that we [14] have done, we have found that for most customers [15] this ten-minute disruption is no problem. However, [16] what we do do is, if there are some customers that [17] that would make a difference to, if there are some [18] customers, say, business customers, that are [19] sensitive to that length of time, we do allow the [20] CLEC to say schedule the cutovers out of hours. So [21] we could do it in the early morning; we could do it [22] late in the afternoon. But for those customers [23] that would be sensitive to that, we do schedule and [24] arrange so that it will not be a problem.

Page 36

[1] So basically the running of [2] connections, the making of the wires, the doing of [3] cutovers, that's maybe not high-tech and grand, but [4] it's business that we do every day, and we do it [5] very well.

[6] That's the end.

[7] MR. LEVY: Thank you.

[8] MR. BEAUSEJOUR: Mr. Levy, the final [9] witness that Bell Atlantic is presenting today is [10] Mr. Kennedy. Mr. Kennedy does not have an opening [11] statement. He will be available to answer [12] questions about the equipment that his company [13] manufactures that permits CLECs to remotely cross- [14] connect UNE-link and UNE-port elements.

[15] He has brought with him a [16] demonstration device of that technology, and I [17] thought that after the questioning, he could [18] perhaps demonstrate the equipment that will permit [19] the remote cross-connects.

[20] MR. LEVY: Good.

[21] MR. BEAUSEJOUR: With that, we have [22] no further preliminary matters, opening matters, [23] and the witnesses

are available to answer questions [24] from the Bench and from the parties.

Page 37

[1] MR. LEVY: Thank you, Mr. Beausejour, [2] and thanks to the witnesses for their opening [3] statements.

[4] I have a few questions in the usual [5] rambling nature that will serve once again to [6] demonstrate the relative efficiency of Mr. Jones's [7] questions when he starts. If you'll give me a [8] couple of minutes, Mr. Jones, I have a few.

[9] EXAMINATION

[10] BY MR. LEVY:

[11] Q: Ms. Brown, I read through the company's [12] filing and listened to your statement. I'm still [13] left unclear as to how and why the company has [14] chosen to propose the particular UNE-combinations [15] proposals it has made here and why it has not [16] chosen to propose some of the others that have been [17] requested by the CLECs. In particular, I'm [18] wondering what principles guided the company's [19] decisions in making these choices.

[20] A: [BROWN] I guess the simplest way to [21] explain this, I think Mr. Albert explained how we [22] looked at the offerings or the suggestions that [23] other CLECs have made in this proceeding. I don't [24] believe that any CLEC has proposed that we offer

Page 38

[1] UNE-Ps with a glue fee, and I think the company [2] noted — and I think that's the only offering that [3] we have not made in this proceeding, and I think we [4] have not made it for the reasons that we have [5] stated on Page 4 of our submission in the [6] footnote.

[7] We have made, we think, some [8] additional and some different offerings than what [9] has perhaps been done in other jurisdictions. [10] Those offerings were made in a way that we think is [11] comprehensive and in ways that will permit and [12] address some of the concerns that have been raised [13] by the CLECs.

[14] Q: I'm sorry, but that's really not [15] responsive to my question.

[16] A: [BROWN] I'm sorry.

[17] Q: My question is, what principles could you [18] give us that guided the company's decision to offer [19] certain combinations of UNEs and not other [20] combinations of UNEs.

[21] A: [BROWN] I think the guiding principle, [22] if I had to pick one, would be, we have — I'll [23] have to pick two. The first one is that we have [24] certain legal rights, and we have chosen to take

Page 39

[1] that into consideration. We recognize what we must [2] do to comply with the Act. We also recognize that [3] other things that we've offered here today are [4] offered on a voluntary basis. So that was a first [5] consideration to us: what was required, and what [6] we would be offering, and it would be voluntary on [7] our part.

[8] The next consideration I think that [9] comes to mind is the issue of pricing differences [10] that we see between UNE platform and resale. In [11] our view, this is really price arbitrage that we're [12] talking about. There have been lots of discussions [13] about service quality. There have been comments [14] about somehow somebody could do something different [15] with UNE-Ps. But when you cut through it all at [16] the end of the day, from my perspective, we're [17] talking about a difference in discount. And yes, [18] UNE-Ps combined are, quote, less expensive for [19] CLECs; and that's a function of the Act and how the [20] Act has chosen to price two different forms of [21] entry.

[22] It also creates an opportunity for [23] what we believe is uneconomic arbitrage. The [24] difference in price between UNE-Ps and resale is

Page 40

[1] significant enough that carriers are saying, "It's [2] less costly and we want it," simply because it's [3] less costly.

[4] Q: Can I stop you there? When you say that [5] there's that arbitrage opportunity, would you be [6] more specific and explain which two things you're [7] comparing that create the arbitrage?

[8] A: [BROWN] There are two — it seems to me [9] there are two ways for CLECs or two principal ways [10] that they're looking at providing service if [11] they're not going to use their own facilities, if [12] they choose to use either all unbundled elements or [13] resale. Under resale the provision of service [14] would be through our retail offerings provided at [15] an avoided-cost discount. Under the UNE-platform [16] proposal — and we've heard lots of variations on [17] it — but it basically says, "Instead of giving me [18] those services at the retail discount, give me [19] those same services, but price them as if they were [20] UNEs, so that I can take advantage of the greater [21] discount, greater effective discount, under UNE [22] pricing."

[23] Q: And that UNE platform as you're [24] describing it here would be NID, loop, switching,

Page 41

[1] transport, tandem switching, all of the above?

[2] A: [BROWN] Sure.

[3] Q: Whatever it would take to combine —

[4] A: [BROWN] What we're really talking about [5] is connecting the link and the port. If you think [6] of switching as being —

[7] We've offered switching here. We've [8] offered switch subplatform, and on the other side [9] you have the link.

[10] What we are not willing to do is [11] connect the link and the port; in other words, [12] effectively replicate our retail service. What we [13] are saying is that in some way, if the CLEC wants [14] to use UNEs — and they can use all UNEs to provide [15] service — that they've got to at least participate [16] in that and put the link and port together.

[17] Q: But I'm trying to understand the [18] arbitrage opportunity here. Given that we have a [19] pricing scheme for UNEs in Massachusetts that has [20] four different density zones —

[21] A: [BROWN] Right.

[22] Q: — and given that we have a resale [23] pricing scheme that is a 20-something percent [24] discount off of Bell Atlantic retail's rates, under

Page 42

[1] which circumstances are you suggesting there's [2] arbitrage? Is it in all of the density zones for [3] all of the service offerings?

[4] A: [BROWN] It's customer by customer. Let [5] me give you an example. Let's just walk through a [6] customer. Let's say I have a customer that has — [7] let's take a residential customer, and on average a [8] residential customer in Massachusetts pays about [9] \$35, on average. That isn't all customers; that's [10] just your basic average. We have customers that [11] pay \$80.

[12] What happens on a UNE basis? You've [13] got to get a link, which on average is \$15, and a [14] port, and let's call that \$5.

[15] Q: You say on average, but it's not on [16] average, because there are four density zones.

[17] A: [BROWN] Let's take the cheapest one.

[18] Q: Or let's take the suburban one.

[19] A: [BROWN] Now you're going to make it hard [20] for me, because I can't remember —

[21] Q: Okay, you start with the cheapest one. [22] Go ahead.

[23] A: [BROWN] I think you may come to the same [24] place either way.

Page 43

[1] Q: I'm wondering if you do. That's the

[2] question I'm asking.

[3] A: [BROWN] I think you do on a customer- [4] by-customer. But what's our range? Give me a [5] little slack. It's between, let's say, \$9 and [6] \$19. Am I ballparking? I don't have my UNE link [7] rates in front of me. But could we use that for [8] our example?

[9] At the \$9 rate, downtown Boston, [10] you're paying \$9 for the link, \$5 for your port. [11] Now you're at \$14. And you're going to pay for [12] calls in and out of that service. Are we [13] together?

[14] Q: Yes.

[15] A: [BROWN] Depending upon the volume of [16] traffic that the customer has — you know, that [17] price is going to go up or down — but on average [18] you're going to be paying about a penny, a penny [19] and a half a minute. That customer will have a mix [20] of tandem and direct usage. That average doesn't [21] vary that much by zone. It varies by a little, but [22] not a lot. So in downtown Boston for a customer, [23] you're starting with a baseline of \$20. That [24] includes vertical features for that customer and

Page 44

[1] usage at roughly a penny and a half a minute. It [2] doesn't take all that long for customers who are [3] only paying — you're paying a penny and a half a [4] minute for the usage versus a customer under the [5] retail tariff with a discount that you'd be paying [6] significantly more.

[7] Q: But under the resale tariff there would [8] not be a usage charge.

[9] A: Under the retail tariff there certainly [10] would be a usage charge.

[11] Q: How?

[12] A: [BROWN] Because under the retail tariff, [13] let's talk about the customers paying. The [14] customer has FR service, downtown Boston. You're [15] going to be paying, what is it, almost — not quite [16] \$10 a line, for the line. You're paying \$7 for the [17] FR usage. You're going to be paying for any usage [18] beyond the local calling area for that customer. [19] You're going to be paying for all the vertical [20] services, call-waiting, call-forwarding. You're [21] simply going to have all those services [22] discounted.

[23] So depending upon the makeup of the [24] customer's service, and depending on the amount of

Page 45

[1] usage I have, if my average usage on a retail [2] basis, even discounted, runs at somewhere around 7 [3] cents a minute, I'm going to be paying more on a [4] discounted basis for that usage. If I can do my [5] math quickly, we'll be all set

here. (Pause.)

[6] I'm going to pay about 5 cents a [7] minute for usage. If my retail rate runs at 7 [8] cents a minute on average, at a 25 percent [9] discount, I pay 5 cents a minute on retail usage. [10] On a UNE basis —

[11] Q: I'm sorry, I'm having trouble [12] understanding why you're applying a usage rate to a [13] flat-rate calling scheme?

[14] A: [BROWN] Any usage beyond the FR area is [15] going to be priced at the retail rates minus the [16] discount.

[17] Q: But how would a CLEC know for any given [18] customer what percentage of their usage is likely [19] to be within the calling area versus outside the [20] calling area?

[21] A: [BROWN] We picked an FR customer. Are [22] we talking average characteristics? Maybe on day [23] one you wouldn't know, but I'll tell you what I [24] would do if I were a CLEC: I'd have a nifty little

Page 46

[1] program, and I'd look at my customer on a resale [2] basis, and I'd calculate my crossover point, and as [3] soon as I knew that customer on average was [4] starting to be a high-volume customer, which is the [5] kind of customer I want to go for, and if I know [6] that customer has a lot of vertical features, I'll [7] ask Bell Atlantic to put him over onto a UNE [8] platform, just convert them out for me, because [9] I'll be able to look at my billing and pretty [10] quickly sort out which customers I want to take via [11] UNE and which customers I want to take via resale.

[12] Q: So you're suggesting that a strategy for [13] the CLECs might be to sign up a customer on resale, [14] study the usage pattern of that customer, and if [15] the CLEC determines that it would be less expensive [16] for that customer to be served on a UNE-platform [17] basis, notwithstanding whatever non-recurring [18] charges or OSS charges or whatever other charges [19] the company has proposed to impose in this [20] proceeding, they would request that they be [21] switched over.

[22] A: [BROWN] Yes. And I might do it [23] initially if I didn't know usage and I had a lot of [24] vertical services, at some point that might be

Page 47

[1] worth my while. It's not rocket science to figure [2] this out.

[3] Let me put it this way: Carriers do [4] it today in the toll market. You convert a [5] customer over to a high-cap facility or voice-grade [6] when it becomes economic based on that customer's [7] usage

pattern to do that.

[8] Q: You're suggesting that a principle behind [9] your decisions as to which UNE combinations to [10] offer, if I'm hearing you right, is basically to [11] preclude the possibility of a loop/switch [12] combination for that reason.

[13] A: [BROWN] We believe that — I wouldn't [14] say it as harshly as you do, but it clearly comes [15] into our decisionmaking process that we believe [16] that this is an arbitrage opportunity, yes. We do [17] not believe we're being unreasonable in asking [18] carriers to participate in the provision of UNEs by [19] making that connection.

[20] Q: I'm not trying in any way to imply [21] anything different from what you're saying. So if [22] the criteria that I've stated — that is, a desire [23] not to permit the possibility for that type of [24] arbitrage — is not the only thing guiding the

Page 48

[1] company in its decision not to allow a loop/switch [2] combination, are there other things that are [3] guiding the company to that conclusion?

[4] A: [BROWN] That's probably the principle [5] behind it. But I would take issue with the word [6] "permit." You can never stop this, but you can [7] encourage it by setting yourself up into this kind [8] of situation. In other words, arbitrage is going [9] to happen to some degree because we have two [10] different price structures. The issue is, are we [11] facilitating that arbitrage? We think we are.

[12] Q: And your decision to permit other types [13] of UNE combinations is being made why?

[14] A: [BROWN] We're trying to be responsive [15] and to help overcome what others have objected [16] to — that objection being principally collocation [17] in all offices. We're trying to compromise. To be [18] perfectly blunt about it, if you had to collocate [19] in every office in Massachusetts and you only [20] thought you were going to keep your customer for [21] three years and you allocated that cost and you [22] thought you were going to get 5 percent market [23] share, the whole cost per customer for collocation [24] would be about \$1.60 a month. We don't see that as

Page 49

[1] exorbitant. If you think you're going to get the [2] higher the market share, the lower that goes down.

[3] Q: Would you just explain the inputs to that [4] number?

[5] A: [BROWN] Sure. 270 end offices in the [6] state. If you took — and we just did a what-if [7] kind of calculation. What if

you had to collocate [8] in every single end office and what if you took 100 [9] square feet of space, and you were trying to get a [10] 5 percent market share? What would it cost you on [11] both a non-recurring and on a recurring basis to do [12] that? That's the most expensive way to go, but [13] let's say you chose that. Worst-case scenario. A [14] 5 percent market share comes out to \$1.60 per [15] line.

[16] Q: For what time period?

[17] A: [BROWN] Per month. If you got a 15 [18] percent market share, it comes to, I think it's [19] about 70 cents a line. But in my mind's eye, it's [20] not as exorbitant as it has been described.

[21] However, we're trying to be [22] responsive and move towards compromise here — I [23] take that back, 89 cents if you had 15 percent [24] market share.

Page 50

[1] We think we've offered some things [2] here that significantly reduce that cost, because, [3] one, we're offering things that do not require [4] physical collocation in a cage, and we're offering [5] an assembly room that's not conditioned space. [6] That's a big cost in the collocation-cage areas. [7] It doesn't require a cage. We've offered virtual [8] collocation. It's a different alternative, [9] different way to go. We've offered minicages and [10] sharing of cages — a variety of things plus the [11] combining of elements that we've put forward, all [12] can come up in different ways, depending on the [13] strategy of the CLEC, to reduce those costs.

[14] Q: If you wouldn't mind as a record request [15] to provide the calculation that is behind the [16] numbers you've just presented.

[17] MR. LEVY: That will be Record [18] Request Combinations 1.

[19] (RECORD REQUEST.)

[20] Q: In New York you proposed something [21] different; correct?

[22] A: [BROWN] We didn't propose it. But we [23] negotiated to that. There's a very comprehensive [24] prefiling statement, and my recollection is AT&T

Page 51

[1] attached it to their position paper.

[2] Q: I'd like to understand a little bit more [3] about the process you used to reach that agreement [4] in New York and how it differs from the process [5] we're going through.

[6] A: [BROWN] I'll give you the best version I [7] can. The entire process in New York is very, very [8] different than in Massachusetts. It's my [9] understanding that they have collaborative [10]

sessions, they have a negotiation process. The [11] company entered into negotiations with the staff, [12] the Department of Justice, and the other parties in [13] the case.

[14] There were numerous agreements [15] outstanding. There are a series of cases in New [16] York that don't exactly replicate the consolidated [17] arbitration that we're going through in [18] Massachusetts. They deal with many of the same [19] issues, but New York had a series of cases they [20] called Lindsider 1, Lindsider 2, and they now have [21] a Lindsider 3 case.

[22] So there are several different [23] avenues going on. There are arbitrations, the [24] commission's own investigation, and we submitted a

Page 52

[1] 271 application in New York. As part of that [2] application process these negotiations occurred.

[3] I did not participate in those [4] negotiations, so I can't be very explicit about [5] what happened. I know they were extensive. It [6] happened over a number of months, and there were [7] many, many issues.

[8] That resulted in the pre-filing [9] statement that's really the culmination of that, in [10] which the company agreed to do certain things. [11] Upon doing those things, the New York commission [12] has agreed to support the company's 271 [13] application. That's my reading of it, not a [14] lawyer's reading of this, but if you'll take it as [15] a layman reading that statement.

[16] Q: Is it your understanding that the [17] commission as a whole has agreed to that or the [18] chairman of the commission?

[19] A: [BROWN] I know the chairman agreed to [20] that. I really don't know. I can't say.

[21] Q: And are the CLECs which are parties in [22] this case parties to that agreement, also?

[23] A: [BROWN] They have not agreed — to the [24] best of my knowledge, they certainly have not

Page 53

[1] supported that agreement.

[2] MR. LEVY: I have just a few more, [3] Mr. Jones, before turning it over to you.

[4] Q: Ms. Stern, feel free to jump in here, if [5] you can provide the answer, also. How is the [6] decision made that your proposal should have a [7] three-year time horizon?

[8] A: [BROWN] I'll start, and Amy, you chip [9] in, please. These proposals — and this probably [10] is also like unto what was proposed in New York. [11] There

were time limitations on what we proposed in [12] New York. There are hard stops to it. We consider [13] what we're proposing here as jump-starting [14] competition. Because they are not required — [15] because we are voluntarily offering to do some [16] things that we think will enhance or assist CLECs [17] in doing certain things — but we don't think that [18] these provisions should be provided forever.

[19] Q: How would the three years work? Is it [20] that the combinations you're offering would be [21] available for new installations during that three- [22] year period? Is that basically the way we should [23] read it?

[24] A: [STERN] Yes, new services could be

Page 54

[1] ordered that way. Existing, if the CLEC had some [2] other configuration for providing local-exchange [3] service and wanted to convert to something like an [4] extended link, they would also be able to do that.

[5] Q: What if there's an existing customer of a [6] CLEC who has begun service with that CLEC during [7] the three-year period and is receiving service [8] through some of the UNE combinations you've allowed [9] during the three-year period and then on the first [10] day of the period following wants to expand its [11] service? Is the customer then permitted to get [12] service under the previous combined UNE [13] arrangement, or at that point must the customer be [14] served under an uncombined arrangement?

[15] A: [STERN] At the end of the duration [16] period they'd have to provide additional services [17] under an uncombined arrangement.

[18] Q: Even if it's the same customer.

[19] A: [STERN] Yes.

[20] Q: You also state that, for example, on Page [21] 10 of Exhibit BA Combinations 2 that Bell Atlantic [22] will provide those services at the relevant UNE [23] prices plus a combination charge. What's the basis [24] for the combination charge?

Page 55

[1] A: [STERN] The combination charge would [2] have two bases. No. 1, to the extent we incurred [3] any additional costs for providing that — for [4] doing that additional connection or combination [5] function or in any way had to modify the service in [6] order to make the service work to provide that [7] function, we would pick up those additional costs, [8] both recurring and nonrecurring, in a combination [9] fee.

[10] In addition, there would be kind of [11]

what we call a glue fee, which is a modest, non- [12] cost-based fee we would charge that sort of closes [13] some of the gap between the UNE and the resale-type [14] rates.

[15] Q: How would you calculate that?

[16] A: [STERN] We haven't designed that rate [17] yet.

[18] Q: Theoretically do you see a different glue [19] charge in the different density zones?

[20] A: [STERN] It's possible. I haven't looked [21] at that yet.

[22] Q: Mr. Albert made the point that the [23] enhanced extended-loop service is the same service [24] that Bell Atlantic provides for its own customers.

Page 56

[1] A: [ALBERT] When we combine loop and [2] transport for our own customers — for example, if [3] we were going to provide foreign-exchange service, [4] where a customer would be getting a telephone [5] number, we would do that by using the same serving [6] arrangement that we've proposed for the extended- [7] link service.

[8] Q: You're not suggesting that someone who [9] does not have foreign-exchange service, that [10] customer's link would be connected by transport to [11] another central office to be switched at the other [12] central office, are you?

[13] A: [ALBERT] You guys can help me out if I'm [14] wrong here. I think this is for the CLEC to [15] collect together end users from a number of COs [16] that they're not collocating in, to take their [17] circuits back to a single collocation point, which [18] would then go from there off to their switch, to [19] provide dial tone to all of those customers they've [20] collected.

[21] Q: I understand the purpose of what it is [22] you're proposing. I'm merely just picking up on [23] your statement earlier that it's the same service [24] that you provide to your own customers.

Page 57

[1] A: [ALBERT] The same technical serving [2] arrangement that we use.

[3] Q: But is it only in the case of foreign- [4] exchange service?

[5] A: [ALBERT] No. For any other services [6] where we're providing inter-office transport in [7] connection with a loop, it's the same technical [8] arrangement, same equipment, that we use to [9] transport that. If you were going to buy a private [10] line, voice-grade private line, that also went from [11] loop to interoffice, if one of our own end users [12] was buying that, what we're proposing here [13] technically is the same

serving arrangement that we [14] also would use to provide that.

[15] Q: This is not a trick question. I'm really [16] just trying to understand. In the case of normal [17] exchange service, the loop would be switched at the [18] local central office; correct?

[19] A: [ALBERT] That's right.

[20] Q: It would not be transported to another [21] central office to be switched there.

[22] A: [ALBERT] That's correct. This is for [23] services where we are configuring them by putting [24] together the combination loop and transport, as

Page 58

[1] opposed to loop and local serving switch that you [2] mentioned.

[3] Q: Also earlier, Mr. Albert, we were talking [4] about the third-party access concept that you [5] suggested has security problems, labor problems, [6] and accountability problems, and I understand your [7] point on that. I also understand what you're [8] proposing as an assembly type of collocation [9] arrangement. Have you considered a cageless [10] collocation arrangement in which the CLEC's [11] terminating equipment is on the same rack as Bell [12] Atlantic's terminating equipment?

[13] A: [ALBERT] Like on Bell Atlantic's main [14] distributing frame?

[15] Q: Yes.

[16] A: [ALBERT] Yes, that was one that we [17] looked at. You're still going to have some of the [18] security problems that you'd have for the third- [19] party access. You're also going to have a greater [20] number of blocks on Bell Atlantic's frame, which is [21] going to clog up, potentially, a number of our [22] frames and use those up faster.

[23] The assembly room I think provides a [24] better arrangement, in that it's a standardized

Page 59

[1] setup that we would use for all CLECs, and it would [2] accommodate additional CLECs over time wanting to [3] combine in that fashion. One of the fears I have [4] with the put-it-right-on-our-frame, besides the [5] fact that it will crap out our frames, is the fact [6] that not every CLEC is going to be there at day [7] one, and as you have them coming in over an amount [8] of time, the places throughout the frame that you [9] locate the blocks are going to get things, you [10] know, more messed up.

[11] Q: Can I understand a little bit what you [12] mean by the vernacular "crap out our frames"?

[13] A: [ALBERT] Exhaust, run out of

capacity, [14] run out of space.

[15] Q: That was not a security issue.

[16] A: [ALBERT] Not that piece. In that case [17] "crap out" was the technical term. But it's we [18] run out.

[19] Q: I just wanted to be clear on that.

[20] (Laughter.)

[21] MR. LEVY: Let's take a ten-minute [22] break.

[23] (Recess taken.)

[24] MR. LEVY: Let's go back on the

Page 60

[1] record.

[2] Q: I have a few more questions, Ms. Brown. [3] In the New York agreement, I believe there were [4] some glue charges as part of that agreement. Am I [5] correct?

[6] A: [BROWN] Yes, there are.

[7] Q: Would you be able to tell us how those [8] were derived?

[9] A: [BROWN] I honestly don't know exactly [10] what the calculations were behind those.

[11] Q: I guess I'm asking: Was there a [12] calculation, or was this basically a negotiated [13] number, or don't you know?

[14] A: [BROWN] I don't know.

[15] Q: Could we have that as Record Request [16] Combinations 2, please, the derivation of those [17] glue charges.

[18] (RECORD REQUEST.)

[19] Q: Just so I understand the company's [20] position in Massachusetts more clearly: If there [21] could be glue charges for UNE combinations in [22] Massachusetts that would eliminate the arbitrage [23] possibility BA - Massachusetts, would that change [24] your position on providing such combinations?

Page 61

[1] A: [BROWN] It probably would change our [2] position. It would depend obviously on the glue [3] charge and the length and the time period involved.

[4] Q: In your judgment, how would we go about [5] calculating the relevant glue charge in [6] Massachusetts?

[7] A: [BROWN] I think there are a number of [8] different factors you'd need to look at. You'd [9] need to look at time periods. You'd need to look [10] at exclusions. The combinations in New York, the [11] UNE platforms — we shouldn't call them [12] combinations, because there are lots of [13] combinations. The UNE platforms are limited to [14] specific classes of service and customers and [15] locations. So there are time limitations, [16] geographic limitations, and zone differences, as I [17]

understand it.

[18] Q: Would it be possible for you to provide [19] us, say, three or four or five examples of Bell [20] Atlantic's view of the arbitrage potential for [21] services in Massachusetts?

[22] A: [BROWN] Sure. I'd be glad to do that.

[23] Q: Let's make that Record Request 3. I [24] guess what I'd look for there, and really rely on

Page 62

[1] your judgment to provide us, not necessarily a [2] representative sample, but, let's put it this way, [3] an interesting sample.

[4] A: [BROWN] How about a range, cases where [5] one might be encouraged to use UNE platforms and [6] cases where one might not, give you a full range, [7] with different classes of customers in it.

[8] Q: That would be good. And I think mainly [9] we'd be interested in the urban and metro zones in [10] particular. I think for purposes of today's [11] hearing, we can put aside rural. But if you want [12] to do a suburban one or two, that would be fine, [13] also.

[14] A: [BROWN] Okay.

[15] (RECORD REQUEST.)

[16] Q: Mr. Kennedy, you've been patiently [17] sitting there. I have a couple of questions for [18] you, which are as follows.

[19] Tell us a little bit more about your [20] equipment. Is this equipment currently [21] commercially available?

[22] A: [KENNEDY] Yes, sir, it is. It's a [23] metallic automated cross-connect system that places [24] a physical metallic connection between two pairs

Page 63

[1] coming into the device. It is available on the [2] market. It is in service currently, with two [3] independent telephone companies, a site in each [4] one, and an outside cross-box application within a [5] regional Bell operating company.

[6] Q: So are you suggesting there are three of [7] them installed right now?

[8] A: [KENNEDY] No, there's actually a total [9] of 11 robots currently installed. It is a new [10] technology. The reason there's technically not [11] more deployed is that we've been going through a [12] lengthy process of Bellcore compliance testing with [13] the product, as well as all of our patent [14] protection and so forth. So it is now at the point [15] where it has completed the Bellcore testing, it's [16] completed field trials with these various [17] customers, and it is ready for deployment.

[18] Q: If I understand the machinery

correctly, [19] would you need to have one of these at each virtual [20] collocation place?

[21] A: [KENNEDY] The design of the product is [22] the same robotic mechanism, but changes [23] applications depending on the type of matrix panel, [24] the large green area. It can be used in various

Page 64

[1] places in the network. The particular application [2] that we're talking about would utilize a 1050 [3] panel, 1050 circuits in one robotic frame.

[4] Q: I'm asking a slightly different question, [5] which is: Do you need one of these robots at each [6] virtual-collocation spot?

[7] A: [KENNEDY] Yes, you would.

[8] Q: Without giving away any trade secrets [9] here, can you give us a range of what these things [10] cost?

[11] A: [KENNEDY] You want total cost of the [12] robot or price per pair? Which way would you [13] prefer?

[14] Q: Whatever way you think would be [15] interesting?

[16] A: [KENNEDY] For 1050 circuits, a single [17] robot, would be 20 K, equipment costs.

[18] A: [ALBERT] It's cheap.

[19] MR. LEVY: He's selling, you're [20] buying.

[21] MR. JONES: No, he's selling, we're [22] buying. And in that scenario, it is cheap for [23] Mr. Albert.

[24] A: [ALBERT] Actually, we've already bought,

Page 65

[1] too.

[2] MR. LEVY: Thank you for the [3] correction, Mr. Jones. It's aptly noted.

[4] (Laughter.)

[5] Q: I take it — this goes back to Ms. Brown [6] and Ms. Stern — that if such equipment were used [7] in the Bell Atlantic central office, that [8] equipment, like the central-office equipment [9] itself, would have to be under the hands-on control [10] of Bell Atlantic staff; is that correct?

[11] A: [STERN] Yes, because we would own the [12] equipment, but for physical touching in the CO.

[13] Q: But the CLEC could control it [14] electronically from outside.

[15] A: [STERN] Yes.

[16] A: [KENNEDY] It is remote access, yes.

[17] Q: But if there were maintenance work on it [18] or anything that required a physical human being to [19] show up,

that would have to be a Bell Atlantic [20] person or presumably a person from your company, [21] Mr. Kennedy, who would come in and —

[22] A: [KENNEDY] That is correct. We do offer [23] complete service packages on our products.

[24] A: [STERN] It would be at the direction of

Page 66

[1] the CLEC, but to the extent it required CO [2] personnel, it would be our personnel. If the CLEC [3] directed us to call in CON-X technicians, then that [4] would occur through us.

[5] Q: And does the equipment use electricity?

[6] A: [KENNEDY] It's minus-48-volt office- [7] battery power. It's a standard office battery that [8] is used in the telephone office.

[9] Q: And what would the connection be like to [10] the power supply of the central office?

[11] A: [KENNEDY] Typically there would be a [12] miscellaneous fuse panel mounted in the top of the [13] relay rack that would be then powered from a [14] battery distribution phase bay or BDFB, as they [15] call it, and then there would be miscellaneous [16] wires, fuse positions to the robots themselves.

[17] Q: And Ms. Brown or Ms. Stern, would Bell [18] Atlantic therefore have a charge for that BDFB as [19] part of using this equipment?

[20] A: [STERN] There would be a cost-based [21] charge.

[22] Q: If I could hypothesize, similar to the [23] way in which the calculation for electric power was [24] made for the collocation cage in the company's

Page 67

[1] collocation cost study?

[2] A: [STERN] Yes.

[3] Q: Would there also be an installation [4] charge by Bell Atlantic to the CLEC for the [5] installation of this equipment in the central [6] office?

[7] A: [STERN] Yes, it would be on a vendor- [8] passthrough kind of basis.

[9] Q: The \$20,000 you talked about, [10] Mr. Kennedy, was the installed cost or the —

[11] A: [KENNEDY] No, that's equipment cost.

[12] Q: Thank you, Ms. Brown, let me just ask [13] you the policy question, which is: If the [14] Department here desired the parties to enter into a [15] collaborative approach to resolving this issue with [16] a mediator, would the company be amenable to that?

[17] A: [BROWN] The company certainly is [18] amenable to trying to trying to come to [19] resolution. Whether we'd be willing to do it with [20] a mediator, I don't know. I don't know the legal [21] ramifications of that.

[22] Q: The issue that's come up, it's clear the [23] negotiations haven't worked to resolve this issue. [24] What we're wondering is whether it would be

Page 68

[1] appropriate to try a different kind of consensual [2] approach, in which the parties and the mediator met [3] and tried to work it out that way.

[4] A: [BROWN] Sitting here today, I don't know [5] whether or not that would be agreeable to us.

[6] MR. LEVY: Mr. Jones, thank you for [7] your patience.

[8] MR. JONES: Thank you.

[9] CROSS-EXAMINATION

[10] BY MR. JONES:

[11] Q: Ms. Brown, I take it it is your [12] understanding of Bell Atlantic's legal position [13] that it is legally free to voluntarily provide any [14] combination of UNEs; is that correct?

[15] A: [BROWN] I think it's stated clearly — [16] and I'm not a lawyer, so I'm not into these words [17] as precisely as you all are. But I think it was [18] stated in our position statement that we are not [19] required, but we have voluntarily provided.

[20] Q: And I just want to be clear on the record [21] that it's your understanding that Bell Atlantic is [22] free to provide any combination of UNEs as a matter [23] of law, that it wouldn't violate the [24] Telecommunications Act by offering the UNE

Page 69

[1] combinations that it has already proposed in this [2] position statement; is that correct?

[3] MR. BEAUSEJOUR: Objection, Mr. [4] Levy. It clearly calls for a legal conclusion.

[5] MR. JONES: Well, Ms. Brown clearly [6] testified to some legal issues in her direct [7] testimony. I'm simply asking her for her [8] understanding of the company's position on this [9] issue, which is relevant.

[10] MR. LEVY: Fair enough.

[11] A: [BROWN] My view is that we have, [12] obviously, voluntarily proposed this.

[13] Q: And your understanding is, the company [14] would not have done so if it believed that it was [15] illegal to do so.

[16] A: [BROWN] We don't usually do

things, I [17] think that's a fair statement, that are illegal — [18] not knowingly.

[19] Q: So there's, to your knowledge, no legal [20] limitation on or no legal rule which dictates the [21] point at which Bell Atlantic decides when to stop [22] offering combined UNEs. That's a matter of policy [23] decision by Bell Atlantic essentially. Is that [24] correct?

Page 70

[1] A: [BROWN] I believe it's a policy as to [2] whether we want to volunteer to do this.

[3] Q: And so it's a question of in what [4] circumstances or in response to what inducements [5] Bell Atlantic is willing to provide particular [6] combinations of UNEs. Is that an accurate [7] statement?

[8] A: [BROWN] I am going to take issue with [9] the word "inducement."

[10] MR. LEVY: I'm sure he doesn't mean [11] it in any derogatory way.

[12] WITNESS BROWN: No, I'm sure he [13] doesn't.

[14] MR. LEVY: Right, Mr. Jones? You're [15] talking about legal inducements?

[16] MR. JONES: I'm talking about legal [17] inducements, absolutely.

[18] (Laughter.)

[19] A: [BROWN] I think it's fair to say that we [20] obviously offered a UNE-P with a glue fee in our [21] negotiated agreement or prefiled statement in New [22] York.

[23] Q: What specifically were the legal [24] inducements in New York that pushed Bell Atlantic

Page 71

[1] beyond where it's prepared to go in Massachusetts [2] in terms of offering the ultimate UNE [3] combination — that is, the UNE platform, including [4] the combination of loop and switch?

[5] A: [BROWN] I honestly was not part of the [6] negotiations and really cannot — I think it would [7] be going beyond anything within my knowledge to try [8] to explain those negotiations. It's my [9] understanding they're very complex.

[10] Q: In the Bell Atlantic position statement [11] filed here, which is now Exhibit Bell Atlantic [12] Combinations 2, you referred earlier, in response [13] to one of Mr. Levy's questions, to the footnote on [14] Page 4. Could we look at that, please.

[15] A: [BROWN] Sure.

[16] Q: I'm interested in particular in the [17] second sentence of the second paragraph. Quote, [18] "Bell Atlantic - Massachusetts recognizes that [19] there are issues that must be addressed and, as in [20] New York, is open to dealing with

them in [21] Massachusetts as part of a comprehensive plan with [22] many interrelated provisions that will achieve [23] regulatory support and approval of a 271 [24] application." Do you see where I am, Ms. Brown?

Page 72

[1] A: [BROWN] Yes, I do.

[2] Q: Now, is that statement properly [3] interpreted to mean that if the Massachusetts [4] Department were to make some form of commitment to [5] support a Bell Atlantic - Massachusetts Section 271 [6] application that in exchange for that support Bell [7] Atlantic would agree voluntarily to provide the UNE [8] platform?

[9] A: [BROWN] I don't know that I am [10] authorized to make that kind of statement. The [11] statement is as it reads. We are certainly willing [12] to try to resolve issues, and obviously, as part of [13] that resolution, there's give-and-take among the [14] parties. What we'd be willing to offer and what is [15] received in return, that's part of a negotiation or [16] part of a proceeding, and we certainly are willing [17] to participate in that kind of proceeding. I don't [18] particularly want to commit the company, sitting [19] here today, to what it will and won't do as part of [20] a negotiation.

[21] Q: The negotiation that would be necessary [22] to provide Bell Atlantic whatever assurance it's [23] looking for is a negotiation not with any CLEC but [24] rather with the Commission. Is that correct?

Page 73

[1] A: [BROWN] I don't know that that's [2] correct.

[3] Q: What Bell Atlantic achieved in New York [4] was some form of commitment from the commission to [5] support its 271 application. Is that your [6] understanding?

[7] A: [BROWN] I've read the document, and it [8] appears to — and the statements that have been [9] made, and it appears to say that. I really don't [10] know. I am also, I think I testified previously, [11] aware that the CLECs did not support this [12] agreement.

[13] Q: Has any CLEC, to your knowledge, in New [14] York endorsed the Bell Atlantic prefiling [15] statement?

[16] A: [BROWN] I do not have specific knowledge [17] of that.

[18] Q: In New York, to your knowledge, the only [19] entity which has made any form of commitment to [20] Bell Atlantic with respect to its 271 application [21] is the commission itself; isn't that correct?

[22] A: [BROWN] I don't have specific knowledge [23] that there's no one else. I

simply know precisely [24] what I've testified to.

Page 74

[1] Q: And if that's the case, then there is no [2] agreement that Bell Atlantic can enter into with [3] any CLEC or any collection of CLECs that would [4] satisfy the condition that's suggested in Footnote [5] 3 on Page 4 absent some commitment from the [6] Commission. Is that an accurate statement?

[7] MR. BEAUSEJOUR: Could I have the [8] question read back.

[9] Q: Let me restate it. It will be quicker. [10] The commitment, to your knowledge, that Bell [11] Atlantic has in New York is a commitment from the [12] commission, from the New York Public Service [13] Commission; is that correct?

[14] A: [BROWN] I think Mr. Levy asked me a [15] qualifying question on that this morning. My [16] understanding is that it was — pardon me; I cannot [17] remember the commissioner's name. The statement [18] has been made. I'm aware of that public [19] statement. I'm aware of what's been said publicly [20] about it. It's my understanding that the chairman [21] supported this. I don't have specific knowledge of [22] every commissioner in New York supporting it, and I [23] think I've testified to that.

[24] The statement here is not meant to be

Page 75

[1] as restrictive as I think you're implying. We are [2] open to trying to resolve these issues with [3] whatever process it takes. It certainly would be [4] the best of all worlds if everyone could come to [5] agreement on this, and we certainly haven't tried [6] to exclude people, and that's not the intent here.

[7] Q: And by "everyone" in that sentence, you [8] would include the Department, I take it?

[9] A: [BROWN] Certainly.

[10] Q: You understand that under the [11] Telecommunications Act it is the Department of [12] Telecommunications and Energy in Massachusetts that [13] is statutorily charged with making a recommendation [14] to the FCC on whatever Section 271 application Bell [15] Atlantic ultimately submits?

[16] A: [BROWN] Yes, and I also understand the [17] Department would have to pick whatever process it [18] felt it could participate in under such an [19] arrangement. That's why I term it as a process [20] rather than a negotiation.

[21] Q: And the Act does not speak to any [22] endorsement of a 271 application required or even [23] suggested by any competitor of Bell Atlantic. Is [24] that also your understanding?

Page 76

[1] A: [BROWN] I think you've gone beyond me.

[2] Q: Now, in New York Bell Atlantic is [3] currently making available ubiquitously and without [4] glue charge the UNE platform; isn't that correct?

[5] A: [BROWN] I really don't know. I do not [6] know the exact arrangements in New York.

[7] MR. JONES: Mr. Levy, it was [8] submitted as part of our position statement, but I [9] think I would ask that we mark as an exhibit the [10] prefiling statement submitted by Bell Atlantic in [11] New York. It might be AT&T Combinations Exhibit [12] 3. Having said it that way, that implies that it [13] might also be some other number. But as far as I [14] know, it ought to be No. 3.

[15] MR. LEVY: Let's call it AT&T [16] Combinations 3. If perchance we haven't used [17] No. 2, it will remain —

[18] MR. JONES: I know we've already used [19] No. 2. The only issue is whether there's already [20] another occupant of No. 3, and I don't think so.

[21] MR. LEVY: Let's call it 3. If [22] perchance we're double-counting, then it will [23] become 3A when the transcript is produced.

[24] (Exhibit AT&T Combinations 3 marked)

Page 77

[1] for identification.)

[2] A: [STERN] Could I try to answer that last [3] question?

[4] Q: Could I ask you to wait just a second?

[5] A: [STERN] Sure.

[6] (Pause.)

[7] Q: I'd like to direct attention to what is [8] now AT&T Combinations 3 at Page 10.

[9] First of all, Ms. Brown or Ms. Stern [10] or whomever, can we agree that this is the Bell [11] Atlantic - New York prefiling statement that we've [12] been referring to previously?

[13] A: [STERN] Yes.

[14] A: [BROWN] Sure.

[15] Q: And at Page 10, the first full paragraph, [16] the last sentence of that paragraph says, quote, [17] "Bell Atlantic - New York will continue its [18] current ubiquitous offering of the platform until [19] such methods for permitting CLECs to recombine [20] elements are demonstrated to the commission," close [21] quote. I'll repeat my question and leave it open [22] to any panelist to respond, whether it is the case [23] that Bell Atlantic is currently offering [24] ubiquitously in New York the UNE platform?

Page 78

[1] A: [STERN] Well, I didn't draft these exact [2] words. But as you can see from the footnote on [3] Page 9, Footnote 10, in central offices in New York [4] City where there are two or more collocation nodes [5] already used for providing local-exchange service [6] at the start date of this, UNE platform would not [7] be available.

[8] Furthermore, for certain services UNE [9] platform would not be available. It's only [10] available for POTS and for ISDN BRI. It's not [11] available, for example, for some of the large [12] business services, like a Centrex, as an example.

[13] Q: Ms. Stern, I'm going to interrupt you, [14] and I apologize for that, but I think we may be [15] talking about two different things. I'm not asking [16] what the deal is in New York that's reflected in [17] this agreement. I'm asking whether or not it is [18] true that pursuant to filed tariff Bell Atlantic [19] currently offers ubiquitously in New York the UNE [20] platform without in fact any of the restrictions [21] that you've just identified.

[22] A: [STERN] Currently pursuant to filed [23] tariff?

[24] Q: Yes.

Page 79

[1] A: [STERN] Yes, that's true. But there are [2] amendments to that tariff that are pending and will [3] be modified to reflect the terms of this agreement.

[4] Q: Well, to be accurate, there are [5] amendments to that tariff that have been proposed [6] by Bell Atlantic - New York and have not yet been [7] approved by the commission; isn't that correct?

[8] A: [STERN] Yes.

[9] Q: And whether or not those will be approved [10] or permitted is a matter for some future [11] determination.

[12] A: [STERN] Yes.

[13] Q: But as of today, there is a ubiquitous [14] UNE platform available pursuant to tariff in New [15] York State; isn't that correct?

[16] A: [STERN] There's not a package called a [17] UNE platform. There is a tariff that says the CLEC [18] may order combinations of unbundled elements.

[19] Q: Up to and including the platform; [20] correct?

[21] A: [STERN] I don't know if the "platform" [22] word is mentioned in there. I don't know if any [23] specific packages are mentioned in there.

[24] Q: I'm not asking you if "platform" is

Page 80

[1] mentioned in the tariff. I'm asking you

if the [2] platform permits the combination of elements that [3] would, if the CLEC chose the right ones, constitute [4] what we're referring to as the platform.

[5] A: [STERN] Well, as I said, there is a [6] currently effective tariff in New York with [7] modifications filed by Bell Atlantic pending that [8] says the CLEC may combine — may order combined [9] unbundled network elements from Bell Atlantic.

[10] Q: Let's pursue this a bit further. In the [11] sentence I've just quoted it states that Bell [12] Atlantic will continue its current ubiquitous [13] offering of the platform. Just to be clear, Ms.

[14] Stern: You don't have any reason or basis for [15] doubting the factual accuracy of this assertion, [16] which is that Bell Atlantic - New York is currently [17] ubiquitously offering the platform in New York? [18] You don't have any reason to doubt the accuracy of [19] that statement, do you?

[20] A: [STERN] No, if the platform is defined [21] as a combination of elements that a CLEC may [22] order.

[23] Q: So CLECs in New York today can buy the [24] platform from Bell Atlantic - New York.

Page 81

[1] A: [STERN] Yes.

[2] Q: And Bell Atlantic - New York in this [3] sentence is representing to the New York [4] commission, in exchange for whatever the deal is, [5] that it will continue to make that offering [6] available until such methods for permitting CLECs [7] to recombine elements are demonstrated to the [8] commission.

[9] And if I understand the language used [10] here correctly, the phrase "such methods" refers [11] back to the two preceding sentences, and I'm going [12] to quote the second sentence of this paragraph, [13] which says, quote, "In addition Bell Atlantic - New [14] York will demonstrate to the Public Service [15] Commission that competing carriers will have [16] reasonable and nondiscriminatory access to [17] unbundled elements in a manner that provides [18] competing carriers with the practical and legal [19] ability to combine unbundled elements." The second [20] sentence I'm quoting, "Among the issues to be [21] discussed in Bell Atlantic - New York's [22] demonstration is the feasibility of," internal [23] quote, "noncage collocation," close whatever [24] quotes I have open. I'm bundling my quote-closing,

Page 82

[1] which I suspect is okay under the Act.

[2] (Laughter.)

[3] Q: Now let me ask the panel: Is my [4] understand that the reference in the final sentence [5] of this paragraph to, quote, "such methods," close [6] quote, is a reference back to the two preceding [7] sentences that I've just read?

[8] A: [BROWN] I've got to tell you something: [9] These words are what they are. I certainly am not [10] qualified. This is a legal document, that the [11] words were painfully worked out. I don't, sitting [12] here today, think that any one of us can answer [13] that.

[14] A: [STERN] There's nobody on this panel who [15] wrote these words.

[16] A: [BROWN] We're going beyond where we can [17] with this. It is what it is. It's the New York [18] agreement.

[19] Q: Well, what the New York agreement is, it [20] strikes me, is pertinent to what we're talking [21] about here and what Bell Atlantic is prepared to [22] commit to in one state, it seems to me, is [23] pertinent to the issues Mr. Levy raised about what [24] principled basis is there for not making that same

Page 83

[1] commitment here, which is why I'm pursuing it.

[2] MR. BEAUSEJOUR: I don't think that's [3] the purpose of today's hearing.

[4] MR. LEVY: If I may go a little bit [5] further: In the company's own submission, back to [6] the footnote on Page 4, the company, it seems to [7] me, is offering the opportunity to the Department [8] and the other parties for a comprehensive plan [9] with, quote, "many interrelated provisions that [10] achieve regulatory support and approval of a 271 [11] application." I for one don't know what that [12] means. I think Mr. Jones's questions about what [13] has been agreed to in New York are pertinent, and [14] that at least there seems to be an agreement [15] among some parties — I don't know which parties [16] exactly. I know this Commission will be curious to [17] know what the company has in mind with regard to [18] what that footnote means in Massachusetts.

[19] WITNESS BROWN: Well, maybe I can [20] clarify it this way: The agreement in New York was [21] crafted looking at New York situations, New York [22] problems, New York issues. If we were to craft, [23] sitting here today — I was to start again and [24] craft one for Massachusetts, it would not be

Page 84

[1] identical to the New York one. I think Mr. Jones [2] has pointed out something that occurs in New York [3] that doesn't even happen in Massachusetts, it's not [4] even at issue here at the moment.

[5] There are other differences here. [6] This arbitration has resulted in a set of standards [7] or will result in a set of standards on service [8] quality different than the New York standards. [9] Those are just some obvious things that would be [10] different. Other issues that are being debated are [11] at different points.

[12] So at any state that we're in, if we [13] were to do this, what we're simply saying is, we [14] wouldn't necessarily start with the New York plan. [15] You'd probably put something together specifically [16] tailored to Massachusetts, and it wouldn't [17] necessarily be exactly like this.

[18] MR. LEVY: I think Mr. Jones and I [19] are coming from slightly different angles here. [20] I'm trying to understand what this statement means, [21] when Bell Atlantic in this case, in Massachusetts, [22] says it is open to dealing with these issues in [23] Massachusetts as part of a comprehensive plan. How [24] and in what form are you open to dealing with those

Page 85

[1] issues? What are you proposing in the way of a [2] process and/or substance for dealing with those [3] issues?

[4] WITNESS BROWN: We have not proposed [5] a process. One way might be upon application of [6] 271; that's the process that was used in New York. [7] Another way might be some other process that the [8] Commission deemed to be appropriate. We don't have [9] anything specific in mind.

[10] We have different rules in New York [11] for negotiating a different — just a different [12] makeup of our staff. This was not done in an [13] arbitration process in New York, and we don't see [14] it being done in the arbitration process, [15] necessarily, here. But we're open to try to define [16] a process. We're not trying to dictate one here.

[17] MR. LEVY: Perhaps I'm going beyond [18] my bounds here. But when I've heard or read [19] speeches by your chief executive officer in which [20] he has stated that getting 271 permission is an [21] extremely important thing for Bell Atlantic as part [22] of its overall corporate objectives —

[23] WITNESS BROWN: That's correct.

[24] MR. LEVY: — and I see a statement

Page 86

[1] like this saying Bell Atlantic is open to dealing [2] with these issues in a comprehensive plan, and then [3] there's a silence after that sentence as to what [4] that means, I'm having trouble understanding, as an [5] observer to the situation, how it's supporting the [6] strategic objectives that your CEO has said are so [7] important to the company.

[8] It's not a question you can answer; I [9] understand.

[10] WITNESS BROWN: I think we're talking [11] about timing here and at which place and where do [12] you start. And I'm not so sure that we're totally [13] clear on exactly how to make this work state by [14] state. We're not opposed to looking at different [15] kinds of processes. We're not saying we wouldn't [16] be willing to participate in it. We just don't [17] have something as predefined as I think maybe your [18] expectation is.

[19] MR. LEVY: I guess my expectations [20] would be, if it was an extremely important thing [21] for the strategic objectives of the company, the [22] company would have a proposal. Mr. Jones.

[23] Q: Ms. Brown, what's your understanding of [24] the current status of the Section 271 application

Page 87

[1] by Bell Atlantic - New York in New York?

[2] A: [BROWN] I don't know.

[3] Q: Isn't it true that Bell Atlantic - New York submitted a Section 271 application and [5] subsequent to certain commission proceedings [6] withdrew it, so that there is currently no Section [7] 271 application pending in New York?

[8] A: [BROWN] I don't know.

[9] Q: Could we have that as a record request?

[10] MR. LEVY: Sure. That's Record [11] Request Combo 4.

[12] (RECORD REQUEST.)

[13] Q: To anyone on the panel: Can you confirm [14] that Bell Atlantic at the highest executive levels [15] has declared that New York is the first [16] jurisdiction in which it intends to proceed and [17] expects to complete the process of getting [18] interLATA authorization pursuant to Section 271?

[19] A: [BROWN] I think the company's public [20] statements speak for themselves on that issue.

[21] Q: And I'm asking whether you can confirm as [22] you sit here that its public statements recite that [23] New York is the first jurisdiction in which it [24] intends —

Page 88

[1] A: [BROWN] We'd be happy —

[2] Q: May I finish my question? Whether New York [3] is the first jurisdiction in which it intends [4] to seek Section 271 authorization?

[5] MR. BEAUSEJOUR: We'll take that as a [6] record request.

[7] MR. JONES: Well, perhaps we could [8] ask if the witnesses are able to answer

my [9] question.

[10] A: [BROWN] I can't quote, and I'm not [11] willing to sit here and answer a question of that [12] specificity without the statement in front of me.

[13] A: [STERN] I can't, either.

[14] Q: Could we add to the request what Bell [15] Atlantic has publicly declared as to its intention, [16] in terms of timing, for making its 271 application [17] in Massachusetts.

[18] A: [BROWN] I can speak to that briefly. I [19] believe there was a statement in which Ivan [20] Seidenberg was quoted in the Boston Globe. He is [21] actually misquoted in that statement. I believe it [22] said in the Boston Globe that it was September.

[23] Q: And what's the accurate quotation?

[24] A: [BROWN] I believe he said fourth

Page 89

[1] quarter.

[2] Q: Did the Herald get it right?

[3] A: [BROWN] I don't know. I haven't read [4] the Herald article.

[5] MR. LEVY: We have a record request [6] numbered 5 on whether New York is to be the first. [7] Is that the record request?

[8] MR. JONES: Whether it is Bell [9] Atlantic's publicly declared strategy that New York [10] will be the first jurisdiction in which it seeks [11] and expects to receive Section 271 authorization; [12] and secondly, what it has said with respect to its [13] expectations for filing for such approval in [14] Massachusetts.

[15] MR. LEVY: That will be Record [16] Request Combinations 5.

[17] (RECORD REQUEST.)

[18] Q: Back to Exhibit AT&T-3. I guess I'm [19] either with Ms. Brown or Ms. Stern. Ms. Stern, you [20] a little bit earlier were describing what I believe [21] are some of the details of the deal in New York or [22] the details of some of the commitments that Bell [23] Atlantic has offered in this pre-filing statement. [24] Looking at Page 9 of the exhibit, it sets forth

Page 90

[1] some of those limitations that I think you were [2] describing. First of all, there are limitations on [3] the platform offering with respect to certain kinds [4] of services — voice-grade, ISDN BRI. There are [5] time limitations on the offerings, four years and [6] six years, depending on whether you're talking [7] residence or business. And then combinations [8] charges or not, depending again on what zone you're [9] talking about, what service you're talking about, [10] and whe-

ther it's residence or business. Is that a [11] generally accurate summary?

[12] A: [BROWN] I don't think so.

[13] Q: It's too bad, because Ms. Stern was [14] nodding her head yes, I thought.

[15] A: [BROWN] I'm just looking at the chart. [16] There's one section that's res. and there's one [17] section that's bus. And four years and six years [18] is, in my reading of that chart, is a restriction [19] of Zone 1, Zone 2 — just as a simple matter.

[20] Q: I was just trying to catalogue the [21] various points. I did say residence versus [22] business, four years versus six years, glue charge [23] versus no glue charge, voice-grade ISDN versus [24] other kinds of services. Those are the kinds of

Page 91

[1] things that we're talking about. Is that generally [2] what we're talking about in this presentation?

[3] A: [STERN] Generally, yes.

[4] Q: And my understanding of this agreement is [5] that none of the time periods, none of the [6] four-year or six-year time periods, actually is [7] triggered until the condition set forth in that [8] first full paragraph on Page 10 has been satisfied; [9] that is, that Bell Atlantic demonstrates to the [10] satisfaction of the New York commission whatever [11] these methods it's referenced in "such methods for [12] permitting CLECs to recombine elements." Once that [13] demonstration is made, then these four- and six- [14] year periods begin. Is that your understanding?

[15] A: [STERN] No, my understanding is what it [16] says in Footnote 9. The duration for both [17] voice-grade and ISDN BRI commence upon availability [18] to CLECs of OSS upgrades scheduled for August of [19] 1998 to the satisfaction of the Public Service [20] Commission.

[21] Q: Let's focus on that footnote, Ms. Stern. [22] Let's hypothesize that the Public Service [23] Commission isn't satisfied until December of 1998. [24] What would be the beginning of the four- and

Page 92

[1] six-year periods in that hypothetical [2] circumstance?

[3] MR. BEAUSEJOUR: Objection, Mr. [4] Levy. That goes far beyond any legitimate area of [5] inquiry in this proceeding. We are here to discuss [6] the arrangements by which Bell Atlantic will make [7] individual UNEs available to CLECs so that they can [8] combine them and whether a specific proposal that [9] we made is reasonable. We're not parsing a [10] document that was presented in New York and asking [11] for witnesses' in-

terpretations of a document that [12] relates solely to the New York proceeding.

[13] MR. LEVY: Mr. Beausejour, I have to [14] disagree. I think Bell Atlantic opened this door, [15] if in no other place than in the footnote on Page 4 [16] of Exhibit BA Combo 2, in which it says it [17] recognizes that the issues must be addressed and, [18] as in New York, is open to dealing with them in [19] Massachusetts as part of a comprehensive plan. For [20] us to understand what "as in New York" means I [21] think is a legitimate question.

[22] Now, if the witnesses don't know [23] exactly what it means, that's fine; and what comes [24] of it, I don't know yet. But I think Bell Atlantic

Page 93

[1] opened that door.

[2] MR. BEAUSEJOUR: Mr. Levy, I [3] respectfully disagree that we've opened the door. [4] We're here in an arbitration proceeding, not in a [5] 271 proceeding. This is an entirely different [6] context. This issue is being dealt with in the [7] context of specific parties requesting specific [8] interconnection arrangements, and I think we should [9] be dealing with it in that context, and not in the [10] broader context that was dealt with in New York. [11] There was no suggestion in the footnote that this [12] proceeding should be — is a 271 proceeding and [13] it's appropriate for those types of issues to be [14] addressed.

[15] MR. LEVY: I'm not hearing Mr. [16] Jones's questions as asking about Bell Atlantic's [17] 271 application. I'm hearing them as asking about [18] this agreement, and I think that's legitimate. Mr. [19] Jones.

[20] Q: I think there's a question pending. Ms. [21] Stern, can you recall it?

[22] A: [STERN] No, please read it back.

[23] (Question read.)

[24] A: [STERN] I can't speculate on that

Page 94

[1] answer.

[2] Q: Could I make that a record request, Mr. [3] Levy?

[4] MR. LEVY: Yes. That will be Record [5] Request 6.

[6] (RECORD REQUEST.)

[7] Q: Let's assume now, Ms. Stern, that the [8] schedule reflected in Footnote 9 comes true, so [9] that by August of —

[10] Well, strike that. I think I know [11] the answer to this; but what is your understanding [12] of the statement in Footnote 9? Is it simply that [13] the OSS upgrades that are referenced there are [14] scheduled to be in place by August of

1998, or [15] should it be read that the expectation is that the [16] Public Service Commission will be satisfied by [17] August of 1998? Do you have any understanding?

[18] A: [STERN] I don't know.

[19] Q: Let's assume that both things happen by [20] August of 1998; that is, both the OSS upgrades are [21] in place and the Public Service Commission has [22] expressed its satisfaction with those upgrades. Is [23] it correct that until August of 1998 the current [24] ubiquitous offering of UNE platform in New York

Page 95

[1] will continue to be available without any [2] limitation as to service and without the running of [3] any four- or six-year time period?

[4] A: [STERN] That offering will be available [5] until that particular tariff gets modified.

[6] Q: Which will happen if and when the New [7] York commission approves any such modification; [8] correct?

[9] A: [STERN] Yes.

[10] Q: Let's look at the chart at the top of [11] Page 9. It is correct, is it not, that the New [12] York commission has approved so far only two [13] density zones in New York, so Zone 1 and Zone 2 [14] encompass the entire State of New York?

[15] A: [STERN] Yes.

[16] Q: In your response to a question from Mr. [17] Levy earlier, Ms. Stern, I think you told us that [18] you expected there to be two elements of any glue [19] charge or combination charge that Bell Atlantic [20] might propose in Massachusetts: One was the [21] recovery of any costs, to the extent that Bell [22] Atlantic incurs costs in providing combinations; [23] and the second was a non-cost-based charge, if I [24] understood correctly, to close the gap between the

Page 96

[1] UNE rate and retail rates. Did I hear you [2] correctly?

[3] A: [STERN] That's roughly what I said, [4] yes.

[5] A: [BROWN] Could I add to that, please?

[6] Q: Not what I just asked Ms. Stern, no. I [7] asked her to confirm what she testified to [8] earlier. So let me ask the next question, please.

[9] MR. BEAUSEJOUR: Then you're going to [10] let Ms. Brown answer?

[11] MR. JONES: She may not want to [12] answer the next one. We'll see.

[13] A: [BROWN] I don't think you have a [14] complete answer on the last one.

[15] Q: Okay. I'll live with it.

[16] Can we infer from the dollar amounts [17] we're looking at in New York that there is no cost [18] involved in providing the platform either for [19] voice-grade or for ISDN BRI services for [20] residential customers?

[21] A: [STERN] No. I think as Ms. Brown [22] testified to earlier, we don't know how those [23] amounts were arrived at. So I don't think you can [24] infer any conclusions from it.

Page 97

[1] A: [BROWN] I also think, to add to that, [2] since it was my testimony, that Ms. Stern has not [3] testified that the basis upon which any glue fees [4] would ever be proposed in Massachusetts would be as [5] she stated. What she testified, to my hearing, and [6] what the company's proposal is, is the glue fees [7] that are associated with what we have offered in [8] this proposal. We in no way have talked about [9] future glue fees or what any proposal might be in [10] the State of Massachusetts. Nor have we said that [11] the glue fees, if we were to do such a thing, would [12] even resemble what's in the New York plan.

[13] Q: Fine. Can you add anything to Ms. [14] Stern's answer to my question, Ms. Brown?

[15] A: [BROWN] I think I testified to that [16] previously, that we don't know the basis for the [17] glue fees and exactly —

[18] Q: My question was: Can we infer?

[19] A: [BROWN] I can't infer if I don't know.

[20] Q: Fair enough. In the Massachusetts [21] proposal the combinations, or at least some of the [22] combinations, that are being proposed, as Mr. Levy [23] has pointed out, are being offered in this Bell [24] Atlantic proposal for three years. Am I correct in

Page 98

[1] understanding the time periods you're proposing to [2] impose on your Massachusetts offering?

[3] A: [STERN] Let me just take a minute to [4] look at them.

[5] Q: If you go to Page 9, the switch [6] subplatform, am I understanding you that it's a [7] three-year offering?

[8] A: [STERN] Yes, the switch subplatform is [9] for three years and the enhanced extended loop is [10] for three years.

[11] Q: Does any member of the panel understand [12] the basis for the four- and six-year proposals in [13] the New York prefiling statement?

[14] A: [BROWN] It's my understanding those were [15] negotiated.

[16] Q: Negotiated between Bell Atlantic

and the [17] New York commission? Is that your understanding?

[18] A: [BROWN] I couldn't even say which [19] parties dealt with this particular portion of the [20] agreement.

[21] Q: So the record here is as clear as [22] possible, my understanding is that the commission's [23] response in New York to this prefiling statement is [24] in the form of a letter from the chairman of the

Page 99

[1] commission to the deputy chairman of the [2] commission. Can anyone confirm that [3] understanding?

[4] A: [STERN] No.

[5] A: [BROWN] I'm sorry, I can't.

[6] Q: Can anybody identify any other form in [7] which the New York commission has officially or [8] unofficially commented on, confirmed, agreed to the [9] conditions stated in Bell Atlantic - New York's [10] prefiling statement? Do you know how the New York [11] commission has done that?

[12] A: [BROWN] I don't know.

[13] A: [STERN] I don't know.

[14] Q: And it's also my understanding that the [15] chairman of the New York commission, who acted in [16] some form or fashion on this within minutes or, at [17] most, days of having done so, resigned and is no [18] longer the chairman of the New York commission. [19] Can anyone confirm that understanding?

[20] A: [BROWN] It's my understanding he has [21] retired.

[22] MR. LEVY: Are you suggesting a [23] relationship between the two events?

[24] MR. BEAUSEJOUR: We should rename Mr.

Page 100

[1] Jones Mr. Starr.

[2] MR. JONES: I think that's the worst [3] thing that's ever been said to me.

[4] (Laughter.)

[5] Q: I'm going to ask a record request of Bell [6] Atlantic. I will state on the record, it is my [7] understanding that the New York commission's only [8] action of an official or semiofficial nature with [9] respect to the prefiling statement in New York is [10] in the form of a letter from now-resigned Chairman [11] O'Mara to Deputy Chair Helmer, now Chair Helmer. I [12] would ask if Bell Atlantic would either confirm the [13] accuracy of that understanding or, if that's [14] incorrect, inform us as to what action and in what [15] form the New York commission has taken with respect [16] to the prefiling statement.

[17] MR. LEVY: We'll make that Record [18] Request 7.

[19] (RECORD REQUEST.)

[20] Q: Is it the panel's understanding of the [21] New York prefiling statement that Bell Atlantic - [22] New York has made no commitment with respect to [23] providing the UNE platform for ISDN primary-rate [24] interfaces?

Page 101

[1] A: [BROWN] That's correct.

[2] A: [STERN] Correct.

[3] Q: Other than voice-grade, ISDN BRI, and [4] ISDN PRI, what services are excluded from the [5] platform commitment — No, that question is not [6] going to work. The New York prefiling statement [7] makes platform commitments with respect to voice- [8] grade services and ISDN BRI; correct?

[9] A: [STERN] Yes.

[10] Q: It does not make any platform commitment [11] with respect to ISDN PRI; correct?

[12] A: [STERN] Yes.

[13] Q: What else is there?

[14] A: [BROWN] I think there are other [15] exclusions listed in here, but I certainly couldn't [16] cite pages for you.

[17] A: [STERN] There are also digital and [18] high-capacity services, Centrex services, just to [19] name a couple.

[20] Q: Digital and high-capacity services that [21] would include — would any of those, Ms. Stern, [22] include the use of off-the-shelf loops or links?

[23] A: [BROWN] I don't know what an off-the- [24] shelf loop or link is.

Page 102

[1] Q: I don't either. You never know.

[2] A: [BROWN] There are exceptions in here, [3] and I couldn't find a page for you.

[4] Q: Ms. Stern, you made reference earlier, I [5] think, to the limitation that's set forth in [6] Footnote 10 on Page 9 of the New York prefiling [7] statement, Exhibit Combo 3, which is with respect [8] to Bell Atlantic's not having an obligation to [9] provide UNE platform in any central office in New [10] York City where two or more CLECs are collocated to [11] provide local-exchange service through unbundled [12] links at the commencement of the duration period. [13] Correct?

[14] A: [STERN] Yes.

[15] Q: That is a limitation that is not [16] currently in effect in New York in the ubiquitously [17] available UNE-platform tariff offering; isn't that [18] correct?

[19] A: [STERN] Yes.

[20] Q: And if I understand the footnote [21] correctly, the measuring point is at

the [22] commencement of the duration period; so that in a [23] central office where there are no CLECs or only one [24] CLEC collocated at the commencement of that period,

Page 103

[1] the fact that additional CLECs may become [2] collocated after the commencement of that period [3] won't cause UNE platform to become unavailable at [4] that central office. Is that correct?

[5] A: [STERN] I'm not positive about that.

[6] Q: When Bell Atlantic sells the UNE platform [7] to a CLEC in New York to provide service to an [8] existing customer who already has physical [9] facilities in place serving that customer and in [10] the circumstance where the customer chooses to [11] switch to a CLEC — assuming the CLEC doesn't [12] change the services it's purchasing, what costs [13] does Bell Atlantic incur in New York in providing [14] the UNE platform to the CLEC for that customer?

[15] A: [STERN] There are costs associated with [16] processing the service order, making changes in the [17] software and billing systems and other downstream [18] systems.

[19] Q: Bell Atlantic has proposed in New York [20] and Massachusetts, has it not, various charges to [21] cover service-ordering/processing costs; is that an [22] accurate statement?

[23] A: [STERN] Yes.

[24] Q: In the scenario I've just outlined, what

Page 104

[1] costs other than those already encompassed within [2] the existing cost-recovery proposals — what costs, [3] if any, are incurred in that scenario?

[4] A: [STERN] I'm not aware of any right now.

[5] Q: So in that scenario, if one element, Ms. [6] Stern, of your cost-based — of your proposed glue [7] charge — and I understand we're not talking [8] Massachusetts, except only hypothetically — there [9] would be no cost-based element of a glue charge if [10] Bell Atlantic were to provide one for the scenario [11] I've outlined. Is that accurate?

[12] A: [STERN] Well, as I've been sitting here [13] I thought of some other costs the company might [14] incur, such as setting up the CLEC initially to [15] have a routing plan in the Bell Atlantic network, [16] some account-management and hand-holding functions [17] to get the CLEC up and running. And Bell Atlantic [18] has proposed rates to cover some of those costs. [19] There could be ad-

ditional costs of that nature that [20] we haven't filed for in New York.

[21] Q: Are you familiar with Bell Atlantic's [22] nonrecurring-cost study filed in Massachusetts?

[23] A: [STERN] No.

[24] Q: So you couldn't speak to whether there

Page 105

[1] are any costs of the sort you just identified that [2] are not already encompassed in the costs studied [3] and reflected in the Bell Atlantic - Massachusetts [4] nonrecurring-cost study.

[5] A: [STERN] No.

[6] Q: Could we go back to Page 10 of the New [7] York prefiling statement, please. I want to look [8] at the second full paragraph on Page 10. In that [9] paragraph — first of all, if I could paraphrase [10] it, and please correct me if I'm doing it [11] incorrectly. I understand this to be a commitment [12] by Bell Atlantic - New York to provide UNE [13] combinations that are less than or fall short of [14] being the total platform. Is that an accurate [15] understanding of what this paragraph addresses?

[16] A: [STERN] Yes.

[17] Q: And in the third or fourth sentence [18] there's a reference to Bell Atlantic possibly [19] seeking authority from the PSC in New York for an [20] additional charge to the requesting carrier for [21] these services. Do you see that reference?

[22] A: [STERN] Yes.

[23] Q: Is that a reference to a combination or [24] glue charge?

Page 106

[1] A: [STERN] Yes.

[2] Q: To your knowledge, to anyone's knowledge, [3] has Bell Atlantic - New York proposed any such [4] specific charge in New York at this time?

[5] A: [STERN] Not at this time.

[6] Q: If you haven't proposed it, presumably [7] the Public Service Commission in New York hasn't [8] approved it; correct?

[9] A: [STERN] That's a good assumption.

[10] Q: So this commitment is to provide [11] combinations of UNEs less than the platform without [12] glue charge, unless and until Bell Atlantic - New [13] York proposes and the New York commission approves [14] any such charge. Is that an accurate understanding [15] of this paragraph?

[16] A: [STERN] Yes.

[17] Q: And at the end of this paragraph, Bell [18] Atlantic - New York explicitly commits that it will [19] not require

collocation for any such combinations [20] except in instances where collocation is [21] technically necessary. Is that correct?

[22] A: [STERN] Yes.

[23] Q: It is correct, is it not, that in order [24] to provide the UNE platform, there is no technical

Page 107

[1] necessity for collocation?

[2] A: [STERN] Generally that's true.

[3] Q: And in fact it precisely — although I [4] don't think collocation is referenced in the [5] preceding paragraph, it's implicit that the [6] UNE-platform offering is an offering that does not [7] involve any collocation requirement; isn't that [8] correct?

[9] A: [STERN] I'm sorry. Repeat the [10] question.

[11] Q: The first paragraph on Page 10 of the New [12] York prefiling statement that we looked at [13] previously, referring to providing the unbundled- [14] network-element platform, it's your understanding, [15] is it not, that that's an offering made by Bell [16] Atlantic - New York which will not require [17] collocation by CLECs?

[18] A: [STERN] You're talking about the [19] platform that's discussed in that paragraph?

[20] Q: Yes.

[21] A: [STERN] That was an offering that was [22] filed prior to the Eighth Circuit Court ruling, and [23] no collocation was required at that time.

[24] Q: And still isn't?

Page 108

[1] A: [STERN] I think that's a legal [2] interpretation.

[3] Q: Well, your understanding of the tariff in [4] New York is that it hasn't changed.

[5] A: [STERN] Yes, the tariff hasn't changed.

[6] Q: So no collocation requirement or [7] condition has been added to that tariff provision?

[8] A: [STERN] I don't think the tariff [9] specifies one way or the other whether or not [10] collocation is required.

[11] Q: Is it your understanding, Ms. Stern, that [12] the commitment Bell Atlantic - New York makes to [13] provide the UNE platform in New York in this [14] prefiling statement is a commitment to provide the [15] platform without requiring collocation?

[16] A: [STERN] Yes.

[17] Q: Ms. Brown, how does the New York [18] arrangement that we've been

looking at satisfy Bell [19] Atlantic - New York's concerns, assuming they have [20] them, with price arbitrage between UNEs and [21] resale?

[22] A: [BROWN] Well, I think I've stated a [23] couple of times, and I'll state it again: We don't [24] know the precise derivation of the glue fees. We

Page 109

[1] don't know the trade-offs, exactly what was made. [2] This is a negotiated settlement, and certainly [3] there's give-and-take here. So it may not address [4] all of our arbitration concerns. Sitting here [5] today saying that is nothing more than speculation.

[6] Q: You just said "arbitration concerns." I [7] said "arbitrage."

[8] A: [BROWN] "Arbitrage." My mistake.

[9] Q: Let's focus on residential services in [10] New York for which there will be no glue charge.

[11] A: [BROWN] Yes.

[12] Q: I think I'll just repeat the question I [13] just asked you, Ms. Brown: For residential [14] services for which Bell Atlantic will impose no [15] glue charge, what else is included in the deal in [16] New York which satisfies Bell Atlantic's concerns [17] with price arbitrage?

[18] A: [BROWN] Well, I can't tell you that. [19] But I can tell you this, that might shed some light [20] on it: New York rates for both UNEs and retail [21] services are different than Massachusetts rates. [22] New York has two zones. We've talked about that [23] today. We have four zones for UNE pricing in [24] Massachusetts. New York has different rates. New

Page 110

[1] York has different rate structures for local [2] service, all kinds of differences.

[3] So what the level of concern is for [4] arbitrage in New York could be very different. [5] It's somewhat speculative at this point in time, [6] but I would add this: As I see it, any proposal of [7] this nature would have to be tailored to each [8] state, and what the issues and concerns are and [9] what the trade-offs are is going to vary, and it's [10] going to vary depending upon how we see the [11] arbitrage and the concerns we have.

[12] Q: Let's take a step back and look at it a [13] little bit more in a macro sense. My understanding [14] is that the arrangement in New York involves [15] commitments made by Bell Atlantic - New York to the [16] New York commission, all of which are reflected in [17] the prefiling statement that we've been looking [18] at. Is that the panel's understanding, that [19] everything that Bell Atlantic committed to the New [20] York commission in exchange for whatever it got — [21]

which I'm going to get to in a minute — is set [22] forth in the prefiling statement that we're looking [23] at?

[24] A: [BROWN] I don't know how to even begin

Page 111

[1] looking at that question.

[2] Q: How about yes, no, or I don't know?

[3] A: [BROWN] We've said "I don't know" so [4] many times on this thing, and we can persist.

[5] Q: That's an answer. Ms. Stern, do you have [6] an answer to my question?

[7] A: [STERN] No.

[8] Q: The flip side is what Bell Atlantic got [9] in exchange for whatever commitments it made to the [10] New York commission. And it is my understanding [11] that what Bell Atlantic got in exchange was a [12] commitment from the chair of the New York [13] commission that if and when all of the commitments [14] and conditions set forth in the prefiling statement [15] prove to be satisfied, the New York commission will [16] be prepared to endorse Bell Atlantic's 271 [17] application to the FCC. Is that consistent with [18] the panel's understanding of what the quid pro quo [19] that came to Bell Atlantic in this arrangement is?

[20] A: [BROWN] I think I have testified to the [21] extent of my knowledge on this earlier this [22] morning; and beyond that, I don't know.

[23] Q: Ms. Stern?

[24] A: [STERN] I think the document speaks for

Page 112

[1] itself, and it says what it says with respect to [2] support for the 271 application.

[3] Q: Let's look at the first page of the [4] document, because we don't actually have in front [5] of us anything from the New York commission. All [6] we have is this that went from Bell Atlantic to the [7] commission.

[8] On the first page, the second [9] sentence says, quote, "Bell Atlantic - New York [10] requests that the chairman of the New York Public [11] Service Commission indicate whether, assuming Bell [12] Atlantic - New York meets each milestone listed in [13] Appendix 1 and discussed below, it will issue a [14] positive recommendation on the Bell Atlantic - New [15] York filing to the FCC," close quote. Is anyone on [16] the panel aware of any commitment requested by Bell [17] Atlantic or offered by the New York commission [18] beyond the commitment to provide a positive [19] recommendation in exchange for Bell